

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SANTA MONICA STUDENTS HELP
THE HOMELESS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleagues' attention to an elementary school in my district whose students are doing their part to alleviate hunger among Santa Monica's homeless community. Every Wednesday, students at Pluralistic School No. 1 bring extra sack lunches to school to donate to the Ocean Park Community Center, just seven blocks away. The center in turn distributes the lunches to the homeless.

The lunch program should serve as a model to other schools that are looking to move beyond holiday food drives to make an ongoing commitment to improving the lives of the less fortunate members of their community. The students of PS No. 1 have shown that anyone with a sense of compassion and some initiative can help. No one need feel powerless.

Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Los Angeles Times which describes the program and the students' involvement in greater detail. I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 14, 1990]

SCHOOL FULL OF COMPASSION

(By Barbara Koh)

It's not on the scale of Comic Relief, but it comes straight from the heart and the kitchen cupboards.

Every Wednesday morning, children at PS No. 1, a small private school in Santa Monica, tote two sack lunches to school—one for themselves and one for a homeless person. They deposit the extra lunches into a crate at the school gate, then the food is whisked to the nearby Ocean Park Community Center by a parent and some students.

The project is the brainchild of the PS No. 1 Parents' Guild community services committee, which wanted to go beyond holiday feeding programs, committee member Audrey Arlen said.

"We also wanted children to feel they participate in something in their everyday lives," Arlen said. By helping to deliver the lunches, the students, ages 5 to 12, see that "what they're doing went to somebody—not just, 'Oh, my mommy's writing a check.'"

The voluntary program was launched last fall, and the response has been enthusiastic, Arlen said. Parents clamored to be delivery drivers, she said, and now, as the school year winds down, lunches continue to come in at a rate of about 30 a week.

The school, whose initials stand for "Pluralistic School," has 89 students. Arlen said that although some families have never contributed a lunch, "every child is aware of

this happening" and is more conscious of the homeless.

A few students who have brought extra lunches said they did so—at least originally—because it's a school activity.

Casey Mortensen, 11, said he participates to help people who are less fortunate. But he acknowledged that "I normally wouldn't have thought of it . . . but [the school] brought it up." Others said they felt powerless to help the homeless, and the lunch program provided an easy way to do so.

The plight of the homeless is not new to the children, most of whom live on the Westside. They see transients on Wilshire Boulevard and at the beach. PS No. 1 classes regularly play and eat lunch at Memorial Park, and uneaten lunches are left for the homeless.

Some of the homeless are probably just lazy, students said. "But some [were] fired from their job through no failings of their own," Casey said. He said that instead of food, he likes to bring shampoo, toothpaste or toothbrushes on Wednesdays, because they last longer.

Homelessness could happen to anyone, children said. "It probably wasn't even their fault," said Danny Levene, 10. "They're regular people—with no money."

"You see them in blankets, huddled in doorways," he said. "It's just terrible to see them."

"But you can understand that they'd go nuts living like that," said Nico Zimmerman, 11.

On a recent Wednesday, it was Nico's turn to visit the Ocean Park Community Center. At 9:15 a.m. Nico, his mother and 6-year-old sister loaded the lunches into the family's Toyota Land Cruiser for the seven-block jaunt from the school on Euclid Street to the center, at 7th Street and Colorado Avenue.

"We're vegetarian, but I put meat in it because I figure they don't get much protein," said Nico's mother, Joan Andersson, describing the sandwich she made that morning. Typically, she said, she'll also pack fruit juice, chips, granola bars and extra canned food.

The family carried in the lunch crate and two grocery bags stuffed with sacks, some of them printed with whimsical penguins and dirt bikes to appeal to children. In addition to the sandwiches, yogurt, trail mix and apple juice, the contributions included a batch of bran muffins and children's clothing.

In the brightly lit center, lines of homeless people snaked up to sleek counters to receive clothing, counseling, referrals to health clinics, assignments to shelters, and lunches and provisions such as dried beans and peanut butter. Other people milled about, chatting to themselves or to one another. Several stuffed their belongings in tote bags or luggage carts. Their clothes were ill-fitting and worn, their hair and beards scruffy.

Andersson crouched down to daughter Emma and explained that the homeless could get showers and food there.

The center, a converted surgical-instruments factory, distributes food to 100 to 200

people a day, Executive Director Vivian Rothstein said. Every year, it serves about 4,500 people. "You just have to need food. We provide it," Rothstein said.

About a third of the food is donated by individuals, churches, restaurants and civic groups, a third is from the Westside Food Bank and a third is bought, Rothstein said. Donations, especially juice and high-protein food, are always needed, she said.

Other schools run food drives periodically, but PS No. 1 is the only one to provide sack lunches on a regular basis, Rothstein said.

Nico Zimmerman said the visit left him sad. "People could give a little more money [to the homeless]," he said, adding that he gives panhandlers any spare change he has. He fired off other suggestions to help the homeless: employment programs, "vacant motel rooms—let them use them, an initiative to give them more money."

His opinion on why they are homeless is strong and clear: "I think it's capitalism. A lot of people are idiots, a lot of people are greedy."

"Communism would be better," he said. Or at least, he quickly added, a combination of "the best of both" capitalism and communism.

Andersson said that, in discussing homeless people with her children, "I just try to make it clear it's just people—who're down on their luck." The lunch project, she said, is "an extension of the way kids are treated [at PS No. 1]. Kids are treated as individuals. . . . You don't put people down."

"Elementary school is the time for kids to learn about people who're different from themselves," PS No. 1 Director Joel Pelcyger said.

He said that the school has had seven deaf students in classes with the hearing children. "If they're not exposed to people who are different, you're led to a lifetime of prejudice," he said.

Given those lessons, said Andersson, "I think it's hard for kids to [understand] how you can just walk by" a homeless person.

The 19-year-old school prides itself on its community spirit. The students, who are grouped by two-year age ranges rather than in traditional classes, have cheered residents of retirement homes and have picked up garbage on beaches. A newspaper clipping of "Top 10 Simple Things to Save the Earth" and a brochure outlining "Twelve Steps to Personal and Planetary Health" adorn the bulletin board in the school lobby.

The annual Jogathon/Bikeathon school fund-raiser netted \$4,800 in March, and pupils decided to start giving money to community groups. The student council granted \$1,200 to the Westside Children's Center for playground equipment, but not before grilling the center staff to see that the funds would directly benefit children rather than adult bureaucrats.

"The school is not a self-contained classroom," Pelcyger said.

"We live here, the [Ocean Park Community] Center is here, this is what we do," Arlen said.

With the lunch program, she said, "the kids are aware, and they're aware on a con-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tinuing basis. Community service has to be an ongoing commitment, not just when you get the guilt."

Mr. Speaker, the children at PS No. 1 should be proud of themselves for making a very real difference in the daily lives of Santa Monica's homeless. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the students, their parents, and the faculty for their efforts on behalf of Santa Monica's homeless population.

LAYING DOWN THE CHEMICAL-ARMS SWORD

HON. H. MARTIN LANCASTER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the attached article be included in the Extensions of Remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article, entitled "Laying Down the Chemical-Arms Sword," focuses on the recent chemical weapons arms control agreement reached by the United States and the Soviet Union at the recent Washington summit between President Bush and Soviet President Gorbachev.

Of particular import is the article's acknowledgment of Congress' role in bringing about this important achievement. While we should take pride in our efforts, we must be mindful that there is much left to be accomplished if we are to completely eliminate the threat of chemical weapons from our world.

Nevertheless, the first momentous step has been taken. As my colleagues consider the following article, I urge them to reflect upon the importance of this recent agreement and to continue to amplify their efforts until we achieve the desired end of global elimination of the chemical weapons scourge.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 20, 1990]

LAYING DOWN THE CHEMICAL-ARMS SWORD (By Dante B. Fascell)

President Bush and President Gorbachev recently made a momentous decision on chemical arms control and disarmament. At the June 1 Washington summit, they signed an agreement not only to begin destruction of their chemical weapons but also immediately to stop the production of these indiscriminate weapons.

This affirmation of long-standing bipartisan congressional efforts to stop chemical-weapons production and use eliminates the inconsistencies and contradictions that plagued the Reagan administration's policy on chemical weapons. For the first time, Congress has effectively stopped the production and deployment of a major weapons system.

Secretary of State James Baker has accurately described the US-Soviet chemical-weapons ban as "a trailblazing agreement." It gives the superpowers a unified stance on this critical issue. By establishing an unambiguous leadership role—for both the US and the Soviet Union at the multilateral chemical-weapons talks in Geneva, it significantly enhances the likelihood of convincing other states to support a worldwide ban on the production and usage of chemical weapons.

This is an unprecedented and unique arms control agreement. It is unprecedented be-

cause it provides for US-Soviet cooperation in destroying their respective chemical-weapons stocks. It is unique because both superpowers agree to immediately stopping chemical-weapons production, thereby providing the best hope for a negotiated global ban.

As the superpowers lay down their chemical swords together, they are challenging all countries to do the same. No more carping and sniping at the superpowers. No more grumbling about past US hypocrisy of wanting to produce new binary chemical weapons while simultaneously expecting others to forswear these weapons. The moment of truth has come when all nations must exert the political will and courage necessary to ban these inhumane weapons once and for all.

It has been a long, hard eight-year struggle for the House of Representatives finally to convince the executive branch of the foreign policy logic, arms control rationale, and good common sense of its position opposing the production of new binary chemical weapons.

It was simply foolish to spend billions on new chemical weapons that were:

Technically flawed and which consistently failed the Defense Department's own testing standards as documented by the General Accounting Office;

Rejected by our European allies;

Demonstrated to have no practical military value; and

Morally repugnant to civilized mankind.

Contrary to persistent Pentagon contentions that binary chemical weapons would somehow add to US security, the only thing they added to was the federal deficit!

Consequently, congressional action effectively stopped a new generation of chemical weapons from being produced and deployed.

This congressional action combined with the summit signature of a US-Soviet agreement to halt chemical-weapons production and to begin destruction stakes out new credibility and leadership for the US on this issue.

When Presidents Bush and Gorbachev laid down the chemical-weapons sword at the Washington summit and signed a chemical arms control agreement, it was a historic arms control achievement. It signaled the beginning of the end for chemical weapons.

This arms control achievement is a great confidence-building measure—both between the two superpowers and between the superpowers and the rest of the world. It represents a concrete example of superpower cooperation at its best. It represents a turning point because now other nations have no excuse for not joining the superpowers in ridding the world of all chemical weapons by the beginning of the 21st century.

PLO CONTINUES TO ENGAGE IN TERRORISM

HON. JON L. KYL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush announced he was suspending contacts with the PLO due to the refusal of the PLO to condemn the May 30 terrorist attack against Israel by the Palestine Liberation Front—a faction of the PLO—whose leader, Abu Abbas, is a member of the PLO Executive Committee. I applaud this decision.

The May 30 attack is only the latest demonstration that, despite Yasser Arafat's December 1988 pledge to renounce terrorism, the PLO continues to sponsor terrorism. Further, Arafat's refusal to condemn the attack and terminate all ties with Abu Abbas, who was also responsible for the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* cruise ship and the murder of American Leon Klinghoffer, calls into serious question his commitment to the pledges he made in December 1988.

In fact, according to a special report prepared by the Adviser for Counter Terrorism to the Israeli Prime Minister, titled, "PLO Terror: A Year Since its Renunciation"—December 15, 1988–December 15, 1989—Fatah, Arafat's faction of the PLO, conducted 13 terrorist attacks inside Israel's pre-1967 borders. In addition, there were 17 border attacks by PLO organizations.

The simple fact is that the PLO has violated the terms of the United States-PLO dialog by its continued terrorist attacks. The record on this is clear. The President's decision to halt this dialog is correct. This dialog should not resume until Abu Abbas is expelled from the PLO and that organization, as a whole, recognizes Israel's right to exist, accepts U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338, and renounces terrorism.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DELORES CROSS

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to your attention the outstanding contributions of one of our country's most accomplished educators. Dr. Delores Cross was recently appointed the first woman president of Chicago University. Once again Delores Cross has caused our hearts to swell with pride in the 10th District of New Jersey. Despite tremendous odds against her, she has always taken that extra step to distinguish herself among her peers. She stands as an example to all of us that tenacity, hard work and dedication to excellence is still a guaranteed recipe for success in America. When the door of opportunity opened, Delores Cross was not afraid of the pervasive gender and racial discrimination that plagues our society. She spoke up loudly, "Yes, me too" and "Yes I can". Her determination and courage has lifted her to the top of her profession and provided inspiration to us all.

A distinguished scholar and professor, she obtained her B.S. degree from my alma mater Seton Hall University. I can testify from experience that the sledding was rough for young ambitious blacks at that time. A true scholar's thirst for knowledge cannot be satiated. Delores Cross went on to obtain her masters from Hofstra University and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. She distinguished herself as a professor and moved into administration as vice chancellor for student affairs at City University in New York. When opportunity knocked there was no turning back for Dr. Delores Cross. She moved on to become presi-

dent of the New York State Higher Education Services Corp. Onward and upward to become associate vice president for academic affairs at the University of Minnesota. Onward and upward to her most recent distinction as president of an important urban university. We know that Doctor Cross' journey has not ended, her energy and commitment will keep nourishing the immense educational needs of our multicultural society.

I might mention that this dynamic and graceful woman is also the mother of two children and runs marathons. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of and happy for this wonderful woman and her family.

RECOGNIZING THE VETERANS UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a program which not only benefits our community, but also helps to reconstruct the lives of our veterans. These veterans, who selflessly dedicated their lives to serving our country and our people, are finally able to obtain the benefits that were promised them upon their enlistment.

In my district, Miami-Dade Community College, an upstanding educational institution which has served our community for several years, has instigated the Veterans Upward Bound Program. This program, funded by the Department of Education, identifies low-income, disabled or disadvantaged veterans and provides them with educational opportunities and skills training. The renewable 3-year grant maintains that the program assist 120 veterans each year. Currently, the Veterans Upward Bound Program at Miami-Dade Community College is serving 132 veterans, many of whom are homeless.

The programs include tutoring and individualized courses in English, reading, mathematics, and computer literacy. It also provides personal and vocational counseling without cost to the veterans. In addition, the program provides GED preparation and precollege courses to those who wish to seek college degrees.

One of the vital parts of the Veterans Upward Bound Program is the counseling they receive for substance abuse. Further, individual therapy and guidance in securing support for rehabilitation is promoted.

One of the most innovative parts of the program is called Bill's Place, a nonprofit corporation which provides necessary housing for the veterans. This is not part of the Veterans Upward Bound Program grants. However, residents must be enrolled in the program, maintain a 2 grade point average, and adhere to the rules of the contracts by which they agree to live.

Currently, there are three houses with eight residents in each. A chairman of each house, elected by the residents, assigns tasks and ensures that each resident obeys rules and attends all scheduled classes and functions.

Each house is run in the same manner as a military barracks with periodic inspections by the staff of Bill's Place.

I would like to recognize the director of the Miami-Dade Community College Veterans Upward Bound Program, William W. Ryan. Through his concern and dedication to this program, he is changing the lives of veterans who stumbled into many obstacles. I am certain that this program will not only benefit these veterans, but the entire community as well. I commend him for his efforts and wish all the Veterans Upward Bound Program participants much success as they embark on their new future.

MANDELA'S BOLD POLITICKING

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into the RECORD an article by Ms. Mary McGrory, the Washington Post, June 26, 1990.

Ms. McGrory's article captures the essence of Mr. Nelson Mandela's visit to the United States. He brought to us a message of hope; a commitment to his fight for freedom; an intellectual honesty not too often seen among public figures. His fearlessness, courage, and eloquence brought new inspiration to people all over the world.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 1990]

MANDELA'S BOLD POLITICKING

(By Mary McGrory)

Imagine finding inside this "Moses"—as Nelson Mandela has been hailed many times on his triumphant tour—a down-to-earth, tough-minded politician?

The first inkling he gave that he is something more than an elderly icon and a symbol for his people came on Ted Koppel's "Nightline" show when he spoke of being beholden to Yasser Arafat, Moammar Gadhafi and Fidel Castro. His questioners were shocked. Too bad, Mandela coolly replied. Your enemies are not necessarily our enemies, he suggested.

The trio the United States loves to hate had encouraged the African National Congress during its darkest days, he explained. The U.S. government, of course, had not. Or, to put it another way, as former House speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill often said: All politics is local. Mandela is obviously having a lovely time, and he seems as delighted as his audiences, but he had to send messages back to the home folk, messages that show that the sensational reception has not gone to his head.

But it was when he got to the White House lawn that he really showed his stuff. Only a politician would have done what he did to President Bush. Here was a man barely out of prison standing up to the leader of the western world and shoving him back about 10 paces. In effect, Mandela told the president that he did not know what he was talking about in regard to African National Congress violent opposition to South Africa's apartheid system, and lectured Bush on the importance of consulting the ANC before he does anything further.

It was breathtaking boldness, carried off with that strangely endearing dignity. Mandela, with his navy blue suit and his formal speech patterns, seems to come from another era, one that never knew the 30-second sound bite. He never looked at Bush while he was executing this affrontery.

Naturally, he looked straight into the cameras, he talked directly to his legion of new fans—the people of New York, Boston and Washington—who stood for hours for a glimpse of him, who greeted him with tears and cheers, who could hardly find words for their admiration. They rarely see conviction. The Republican president got where he is by being supple. The Democrats in Congress hasten to fashion compromises with the care they once applied to legislation they believed in. Mandela, the holdout, is magic and unique.

On the White House lawn, Bush was almost a prop. When his guest had finished, all he did was marvel, "No notes—wonderful."

Mandela knew he had taken the East Coast by storm. He is a compelling figure, hopelessly non-intrusive to local counterparts. Which one of them would stay in jail for 27 years and come out smiling, would have the patience and endurance to tough it out, foreseeing that a decent president like Frederik W. de Klerk would have to release him unconditionally just because he needed someone to talk to?

Although Mandela says fairly convincingly that he wants to "let bygones be bygones"—his wife Winnie is of a different school—he can be harsh with de Klerk. On "Nightline," he said de Klerk did "nothing"—which was probably a way of telling the ANC that he was as militant as ever. On the White House lawn, he was a little kinder to his liberator. He wanted to help de Klerk "maintain his position," he said.

He brought to Washington, which is undergoing the drug-and-perjury trial of its black mayor, Marion Barry, the same sort of healing that he seems to have imparted to New York and Boston. Irritated New Yorkers slowed down to watch him. In Boston, home of liberal causes and racial tensions, black and white joined in common joy at his coming. Outside the White House, tourists shrieked as he passed.

It was as if some sort of general amnesty had been declared. Blacks are proud of him: He is the first world-class leader they have had since Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated. Whites are grateful to him: He survived the worst that a white government could do to him, and he talks about education and principles and the official, institutionalized racism of apartheid, not the ersatz; version claimed by unscrupulous black politicians.

And if he is a politician, he is a good one. He used those long years behind bars to good effect. He not only founded a clandestine institution of higher learning, he organized a headquarters for the ANC behind bars. And he thought things through. So when someone pointed out the contradiction of his saying that the human rights records of Arafat, Gadhafi and Castro were not his business, while demanding the world take a part in South Africa's domestic affairs, he could say, with grandeur, that apartheid is so monstrous a practice that the world has a moral obligation to interfere.

PENNSYLVANIA NEWSPAPER
WINS PULITZER

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the last of 10 editorials written by Tom Hylton of the Pottstown Mercury in Pottstown, PA.

These editorials on the subject of farmland preservation won this year's Pulitzer Prize for editorial writing, and I commend them to my colleagues.

**THE LAND IS OURS TO PROTECT FOR OUR
CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN**

As this century dawned, Rotterdam was Europe's greatest harbor and one of its most ancient cities. It was a fairytale setting of clocktowers and gables, tile roofs and narrow cobblestone streets.

Then, on May 14, 1940, the German bombers came. In less than three hours, 600 years of history were wiped from the face of the earth.

The paving over of rural Chester County lacks the drama, the malevolence—and the shocking suddenness—of the blitzkrieg on Rotterdam.

The result will be the same

The Dutch rebuilt Rotterdam, and it is a great and vibrant city. But its history is confined to the library and we are all the lesser for it.

Chester County will always have Valley Forge, Longwood Gardens, the Wythe museum, and other monuments to its magnificent past.

But when its gently rolling hills are covered with housing projects, and its quiet country roads are widened, straightened, and lined with convenience stores, then the heart and soul of Chester County will be gone forever.

The transformation of historic countryside into modern suburbia will come not at the hand of a madman, but through our own folly. Unfortunately, many people do not realize the scope of recent commercial and housing construction. They don't appreciate how close Chester County is to permanently losing its rural character.

A sense of identity, a pride in our home and surroundings, is what we need. Chester County is beautiful beyond compare. The rolling farmland, the wooded hillsides, the streams and wildlife are precious endowments we all enjoy. They have been handed down to us from generation to generation, and they are ours to protect for our children and grandchildren. We have a responsibility to be good stewards of our land.

It makes no difference how much farmland is left in the Midwest; or how many forests there are in the Appalachians. Chester County is our home.

The proposed \$50 million bond issue on the Nov. 7 ballot will provide funds for open space and farmland preservation. The bond issue is indispensable to protect our heritage. The cost is small; measured in terms of generations, it is trivial.

Last fall, Mercury columnist Cindy Mitch described feelings that many of us share:

A few days ago I trekked up a hill in Chester County. You get to this hill by making your way through a tangle of branches and fallen tree limbs. Your feet slide off small rocks hidden by a thick carpet of moss and dead leaves. If you look up at just the right

time, and are very, very quiet, you come eyeball to eyeball with a doe and her fawn. There is no sound except for the birds and the movements of small animals and the rhythm of your heart beating in unison with the life of the forest.

I sit up here on this hill and I think about the vegetable stand next to the Country Tavern. I think of how my grandmother used to chop firewood on cold winter days just a few yards down the hill from where I'm sitting. I think of my grandfather and how he once broke wild horses on this land.

I remember nights in this forest when the only illumination was the light streaming down from the moon and stars. I remember how we could stand out here alone and not be afraid of the darkness, because there was nothing out here that would hurt us. When I was a kid I knew the land would be good to me simply because I was good to the land. Back then, we had an unspoken pact with Mother Nature. In the ensuing years, we broke it.

There are people coming around here now destroying this land. They pay lip service to it. They claim they have a feel for the land and its history. They're lying.

When you have a feel for this land you don't destroy it to build houses and resorts and office complexes. When you have a feel for the land you nurture it. You respect it. You treat it the way you would like it to treat you.

And then you pick up a multi-colored leaf and some cool, damp moss and a dried twig or two. And you hold these things as close to your heart as you possibly can before they slip away from you.

The Chester County we love is slipping away from us. Once it's gone, it's gone. The \$50 million bond issue is essential to protect what we have left. We urge all Chester County voters to go to the polls Nov. 7 and vote yes to save open space.

IN MEMORY OF C.R. SMITH

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I am inserting into the RECORD a statement concerning Mr. C.R. Smith who died on April 10, 1990.

This morning the fine people in my district are mourning the passing of an aviation legend.

C.R. Smith, who was put to rest at Arlington National Cemetery last week, was a man who helped build American Airlines into one of the world's largest and most successful airlines.

Mr. Smith was a giant in an era of aviation pioneers. He entered the airline business in the days of open cockpit biplanes—and began building American into a company that today operates more than 500 jetliners flying the globe.

But "Mr. C.R.," as he was affectionately known, was more than a pioneer. He was a sensitive manager who touched the lives and hearts of thousands of men and women who worked for his airline or who traveled on American. The affection he inspired has been demonstrated clearly by the outpouring of praise that followed his passing.

C.R. Smith was part of the heart and soul of American Airlines—and of the modern aviation industry. He will be sorely missed.

**SKELTON SPEAKS TO MARINE
CORPS COMMAND AND STAFF
COLLEGE GRADUATION**

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 of this year I was privileged to deliver the graduation address at the U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College in Quantico, VA. In acknowledgment of those graduates and their achievements, I respectfully submit the text of that speech:

**GRADUATION ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN IKE
SKELTON**

INTRODUCTION

We gather today to celebrate the achievement of hard work well done. Those officers who have spent the past 10 months at this command and staff college know well the exciting changes that have taken place at this institution of higher learning over the past few years. You have benefited from those changes. The curriculum has evolved from a disparate combination of courses in tactics, management, and political science to an integrated set of courses that focuses on the art of war at the operational level. That concentrated focus has also prepared you for thinking in strategic terms and at the same time has prepared you for joint operations.

Let me extend my sincere congratulations to all of you on today's achievement. Savor today's accomplishment, but now is not the time to rest, much work remains to be done. You are now ready to put to use the knowledge you have gained over this past year. Most of you will leave this center of learning and put your education to work in operational units scattered across this country and the vast oceans and continents beyond. At the same time, however, I hope you will share with those who remain behind—your former instructors and the school director—an honest appraisal of this past year's work. Let them know if you were challenged, what insights you gained, what changes you would make to the curriculum, teaching staff, and method of instruction. Over the next six months I hope you will make time in a busy schedule to provide them this necessary feedback.

The changes taking place at this command and staff college must continue if the hope to make this institution a world-class center of military learning is to be fulfilled. Those in positions of authority—both here and at Headquarters Marine Corps—need to use this precious period of peace. They need to make the schools here at Quantico so good, that you leave here knowing that you are par excellence, that senior strategists in the world would look to you for the most educated commentary on warfare, and that your battlefield decisions would be such that parents would want their sons under your command in time of conflict. And, in the ultimate test—combat—your decision-making should be so superior that you could overcome any adversary.

BUDGET PRESSURES AND THE WORLD IN 1990

As you know the Department of Defense is in its sixth straight year of real cuts in the defense budget. In the mid-1980s the pressures on defense spending came on two fronts—the internal one of budget deficits and the external one of trade deficits. Now, in the 1990s the defense budget will come under even greater pressure as a result of the stunning events that took place in Eastern Europe in the last half of 1989. The collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the changes taking place in the Soviet Union present the United States with a diminished threat to peace in Europe.

The world in 1990 is a far different place than the world that existed just a year ago. The ideals of freedom, democracy, and human rights, for which this country has sacrificed much blood and treasure over the past 50 years, have affirmed throughout the world—in Eastern Europe, Nicaragua, South Africa, and even the Soviet Union. The "long twilight struggle"—the words used by President Kennedy to describe the bitter contest against Communist expansion—is coming to an end.

But the world of 1990 is still a perilous one. Taking the long view of history we should realize that this is nothing new. We still live in the nuclear age and the hazards of it are still with us, if less keenly felt. Even after the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union have been reduced through negotiations, each side will still possess thousands of nuclear weapons. This nation will still have to deal with a Soviet Union that will remain a great power.

Elsewhere, the United States will have to cope with the consequences of increasing military power in countries throughout the world. Nuclear and chemical weapons proliferation, in conjunction with the spread of ballistic missile and other technologies, afford the potential for countries such as Syria, Libya, Iraq, Iran, and others to figure on the world stage. In the Far East, for example, Stalinism still holds sway in North Korea, China, and Vietnam. I believe Korea must rank as the most probable country in the world where American forces could become engaged in large scale combat.

So while we can relax a bit because of the improvement in American-Soviet relations, these other challenges will continue to confront us for the foreseeable future. Before we disarm too far, as some in this country would have us do, I believe it would be better to assess the threats we face before we arbitrarily slash our defenses. In 1935 Winston Churchill warned his countrymen that "wars come very suddenly." It would be a warning well worth keeping in mind in 1990. In other words, the ordeal of the 20th century is not over.

In many ways the present period is comparable to the months immediately after World War II. There was much joy then because the war had been won. The cry throughout the country was "bring the boys home"—and we did. However, the future at that time was uncertain. Little did we realize the strategic threat that Stalin's Russia would assume in just a few short months and war in Korea in five short years.

Today, there is again much happiness in the West. As in 1945 the call was gone out again to cut the defense budget. Once again however the future was unclear. Yet defense leaders have to make decisions today to design military forces that will defend the world-wide interests of the United States in the post-cold war era. Unfortu-

nately, many of those decisions are driven by budgetary pressures rather than strategic considerations. At the same time, trying to put together a military strategy is very difficult, if not impossible, when there is no consensus about a new national security strategy.

COPING WITH CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES

During this period of uncertainty in the world and of declining defense budgets it is imperative that we strengthen the renewed educational effort that has taken place in the military over the past few years. This renewed interest in military education has come in the wake of the Goldwater-Nichols legislation of 1986. I would like to think that the House Armed Services Committee panel on military education has also played a constructive role in renewing the interest in military education.

Usually such changes, whether in defense organization or military education, come only after some great shock to the system. For example, an interesting case of an Army trying to cope with changed circumstances is that of the French Army after the crushing defeat in the six week Franco-Prussian war of 1870. The lesson for French Army leaders can be summed up in one word—"Elan", the offensive spirit. The memory of Sedan—"never speak of it; think of it always"—infected French military leaders for more than forty years. Combined with the national desire for "revanche", the French Army eagerly charged into battle in 1914 hoping that a short violent offensive campaign would restore the glory of France and the French Army that had been lost at Sedan. Unfortunately, the French military proved itself inflexible in its thinking. Forty years of studying only offensive tactics left the French Army ill-prepared when the time came to go wage a defensive struggle, as happened unexpectedly in the early fall of 1914. A short campaign turned into a four year stalemate in the trenches that stretched from Switzerland to the English Channel. Defense, not offense, marked that would one day come to be known as the great war.

After the first world war French military leaders once again devoted much thought to the problem of war in the modern era. Exhausted but victorious, France tried to fashion defense policies that would ensure the security of the nation for the day when Germany would once again be a key player in the affairs of Europe.

If "elan" had proved a bust for an earlier generation, then maybe defense offered the answer to the problem of securing the safety of the country. Here the bloody experience of trench warfare cast its long shadow. Once again, however, inflexible conformist thinking, firmly embedded among civilian authorities in government and in the French general staff, undermined sound defense planning. Offensive tactics employed in the Spanish Civil War and later in Poland during the first campaign of the second world war did little to shake the confidence of the French general staff in the primacy of the defense. The blitzkrieg tactics of the German Army in the spring of 1940 with its tragic results for the French nation revealed just how wrong were the lessons learned by the French general staff after World War I.

STRATEGIC VISION

We in the United States succeeded at the higher level of strategic thinking prior to World War II, because our command and staff and war college during the 1920s and

1930s produced officers of exceptional character and strategic vision. As a nation we emerged victorious from World War II in no small measure because of the moral and intellectual strengths found at the highest levels of the American officer corps.

Unfortunately, after the war we became complacent. Strategic thinking atrophied after 1945. In the nuclear age many believed that the ideas and thoughts associated with classical military history and strategy had been rendered obsolete.

Maurice Comte De Saxe, the famous French military analyst, noted that "few" men occupy themselves in the higher problems of war. They pass their lives drilling troops and believe this is the only branch of the military art. When they arrive at the command of armies they are totally ignorant, and in default of knowing what should be done—they do what they know."

Doing what one knows, rather than what should be done, is a problem which many military commanders have faced throughout history. It's a problem not unfamiliar to the American military in the recent past. I would contend that in Vietnam the American military did what it knew—fighting the conventional war which it had fought in World War II and Korea—rather than knowing what to do—fighting the Revolutionary War in which it became engaged. It took ten years to put together a strategy to win the Vietnam war. By that time it was too late. The patience of the American public had come to an end.

The bitter experience of Vietnam, which resulted from a loss of strategic vision, sent American military men back to the study of war and military history. Many of you here today are the beneficiaries of that renewed interest in the study of war. I hope you have learned that a military career includes a life long commitment to self-development. It is a process of education of study, of reading, and of thinking that should continue for the rest of your professional military life.

Yes, tactical proficiency is very important, but so too is strategic vision. It can only come after years of careful reading, study, reflection, and experience. You need to be aware of the natural yardstick of 4,000 years of recorded history. Thucydides, Plutarch, Sun Tzu, Clausewitz, Napoleon, Mahan and Mackinder have much to offer tomorrow's future generals and admirals. Today's officer corps must be made aware of this inheritance. If you have been made aware of this inheritance over the past ten months, you will have fulfilled the sacred trust your superiors—and indeed our Nation—have placed in your hands today.

Winston Churchill put this idea in these words: "Professional attainment, based upon prolonged study, and collective study at colleges, rank by rank, and age by age—those are the title reeds of the commanders of the future armies, and the secret of future victories."

DIFFICULT DAYS

On a personal level, let me express to every one of you—and your parents, wives, and children—my sincere thanks for what you do. Yours is a stern and demanding profession. We, your fellow countrymen, depend on you and your willingness to make the great sacrifices that you do. Too few of us appreciate those sacrifices. And the irony is that we would not have this Nation if it were not for professionals such as you who bear with it through the good times and the bad.

I must confess to you the concern I have about the security of our country as I look to the future. My fear is that in some ways we may return to the difficult days for our military that we went through in the 1930s and more recently after Vietnam. In an address to the Military Schools and Colleges Association in 1923 Maj. George C. Marshall noted, "The regular cycle in the doing and undoing of measures for the national defense." He observed that, "we start in the making of adequate provisions and then turn abruptly in the opposite direction and abolish what has just been done."

I do not believe our Nation will make the drastic cuts it made in its security in the 1930s, but these next few years for those in the military will be difficult ones nonetheless. Many of my colleagues would not hesitate in cutting the army numbers to 300,000. Some would be quite happy to do away with the marine Corps by consolidating it with the Army. A few weeks ago, during the consideration of the budget measure in the house, there were 90 votes for a budget that cut next year's military outlay expenditures by \$23 billion. As you know, the outlay cuts would mostly be in manpower and operation and maintenance. The budget that passed, which I voted against, will cut defense expenditures by \$11.5 billion. Should that be the final budget figure, you will see draconian reductions.

The temptation to become discouraged for those serving in uniform will grow. Please do not give in to it. In moments of doubt recall the words of Franklin Roosevelt: "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith." We do not know what tomorrow holds. There is no crystal ball in which to look to foretell the future. Only a kaleidoscope with its uncertain patterns gives us a clue to what lays in store for uniformed Americans. Whether you will march again to the Halls of Montezuma or sail to the shores of Tripoli we do not know. But you should be guided by the words of Robert E. Lee: "Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more. You should never wish to do less."

Again, thank you for your kindness and your invitation to speak today. I congratulate you on this milestone accomplishment in your life. I wish you godspeed on your journey to keep our country free and secure.

A TRIBUTE TO NELSON MANDELA

HON. PETE GEREN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, these are the days when the walls of oppression and totalitarian rule crumble down. These are the days when the call of freedom rings its loudest and the flame burns its brightest.

A new march toward freedom is being taken up around the globe, in the public squares of China, in the halls of the Politburo, and in the streets of Berlin. For the people of South Africa, however, this struggle is neither sudden, nor new. This battle for freedom is the only life that the black South African has ever known.

Each struggle for freedom, past and present, has its leader. The people of South Africa have the great Nelson Mandela.

His message is universal. We were inspired by the same message spoken by Lech Walesa as he stood before us to tell us of the Polish struggle for freedom. It was the message delivered by the Chinese students as they stood before the tanks of the Chinese army in Tiananmen Square. It was the message of our own forefathers as they built a democratic society.

Mandela's struggle is the staff upon which his people have leaned since he took up the cause in 1944. His imprisonment served only to ignite the forces for democracy in South Africa, elevating him to something more than just a man. Mandela is the embodiment of the struggle for freedom in South Africa.

Throughout his captivity and today, Mandela's spirit has lived on in the hearts of all South Africans, white and black, who have sought peace, justice, and liberty for all. He has carried the flag of liberty high, with dignity and respect, with honor and strength. He is a reminder to those who seek to maintain apartheid of the futility of their struggle.

The path down which his struggle has taken him would have defeated most. For others, it would have led them on the path to extremism. But Mandela has never lost his commitment to democracy. He says:

I have fought against white domination and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony with equal opportunities. It is an idea which I hope to live for and achieve, but if need be, an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

It is a bitter irony that the same year the United States passed its first guarantee of civil rights for all Americans, Nelson Mandela was sentenced to life in prison for fighting the same fight. It was a cause our own Reverend King died to defend. It is a cause we must still fight for every day.

As the struggle for equality continues in South Africa and around the world, we in the United States have a unique opportunity to renew our own commitment to civil rights. The Civil Rights Restoration Act stands before Congress, a bill to restore the spirit of the 1964 civil rights law that some seek to disembody. Nelson Mandela repeatedly rejected conditional offers for freedom over the years because he knew true equality could know no boundaries. We must not impose them either.

The boundaries of his prison walls did not confine the spirit of Nelson Mandela but only served to strengthen his resolve. Mr. Mandela has referred to his 26 years in prison as "long, lonely, wasted years." Yes, they were long and lonely, but they were far from wasted. It was from that jail cell that he became the personification of all black South Africans imprisoned by the chains of oppression.

A year ago, Nelson Mandela sat alone in a jail cell. Today, he stands with us in this great institution of democracy. Our cause for freedom has been carried so far by the spirit of Nelson Mandela. Yet, we have so far to go. In these tumultuous times, we must look more than ever to the need for understanding, the importance of community, and the future of civil rights. It is for these things Nelson Mandela lives. We must do the same.

TRIBUTE TO CHATMAN FAMILY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by their fruits ye shall know them—Matthew 7:20. Records are not precise, but in the decade preceding the 20th century God brought Dyke Ross Chatman and Warren Pete Chatman together in matrimony. Their descendants are gathering in celebration this month at Newark, NJ, to count their blessing and have a good time. Strong families are the substance out of which a strong nation is made. We are blessed when families come together for the purpose of strengthening the family bond for we, as a nation, are strengthened by that enterprise. During a particularly difficult time in our history—when black men were being lynched in record numbers—Warren Pete and Dyke Ross Chatman provided strong leadership and values to their eight children. The fruit from this strong union was firm and of substance: Ulysses—a school principal; Marie—a guidance counselor; Warren—owner of a bowling alley; Lillian—a teacher; Grace—a secretary; Ernestine—a dietitian; Eugene—food distributor; and Gwendolyn—a teacher. The union was blessed with 16 grandchildren including a lawyer, investment banker, businessman, program director, public health nurse, teacher, policeman, physicist, civil servant, vice principal, vocational education teacher, banker, linguist and three computer specialists. The 32 great-grandchildren and 2 great-great-grandchildren of the union are following their ancestors' footsteps and distinguishing themselves in a wide variety of State building professions.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 10th District of New Jersey, I hereby herald and commend the Chatman family reunion which will be held at Newark, NJ, on June 29 through July 1, 1990. In calling together the outstanding fruits of this blessed union the Chatman family demonstrates family solidarity and love for each other that is an inspiration to our community.

RECOGNIZING "SIRA" FOR EXCELLENCE IN SERVING THE PUBLIC

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the International Society of Amateur Operators, better known as SIRA (La Sociedad Internacional de Radio Aficionados, Inc.). This public service group was founded in Miami, FL, on December 4, 1971, and has remained a very successful nonprofit, non-political, and all-volunteer organization.

SIRA's local activities are focused on the first bilingual repeater in the United States transmitting from the Nine Island Condominium located in Miami Beach. It links low pow-

ered handheld and mobile units with public service agencies in Dade, Broward, and Monroe Counties. Thanks to the repeater and its battery back-up, SIRA has stood firm through blackouts and riots—1980 and 1989—to carry information to the media. Together with SIRA's strategic location, the repeater has been able to keep contact with the Key Largo area in the event of hurricanes and has aided in the locating and rescuing of numerous persons who have been lost or adrift at sea.

Internationally, SIRA has been equally as vital. When Nicaragua—1972, and Guatemala—1976, were leveled by a series of earthquakes, SIRA's correspondents in the stricken areas broadcasted details of the disasters over its emergency network and alerted the rest of the world. Where others would not venture, SIRA flew to the scene to establish special communication links with OAS in Washington, DC, consulates across the nation, the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, Sister Cities International and other top level agencies. SIRA, with its limited resources, was even able to out do TV and radio marathons in delivering relief to the victims. Time and time again, SIRA has repeated itself by rushing to the scene of tragedy with aid in hand 24 hours a day. SIRA was there in places such as Mexico City—1985, and El Salvador—1986, when they were leveled by tremors; Armero, Colombia when entombed by volcanic mud slides; and the endless number of locations threatened by killer hurricanes such as Kate, Gilbert, Joan, Hugo, and Fifi.

Thanks to individuals like Rafael M. Estevez, president; Jose Sarda, vice president; Sabastian Jaime, secretary; and Nilo Ruisanchez, treasurer, who concentrate on the interest of the public, we have organizations such as SIRA who care for their fellow man and wish to serve him.

ONE MAN SITTING IN A LITTLE OFFICE WRITING ON A YELLOW PAD

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, speaking of the powerful civil rights establishment, economist Thomas Sowell says:

They're worried about one man sitting in a little office out in California writing on a yellow pad. They don't feel themselves capable of countering what I might say.

What is it that so frightens the leaders of the civil rights movement that they threatened to boycott a recent meeting with President Bush if Dr. Sowell were to attend? The attached article from the June 26 edition of the Washington Times examines Dr. Sowell's critique of the effects of affirmative action programs on the two-thirds of Americans who qualify as minorities under the civil rights laws.

I would like to highlight several of Dr. Sowell's observations:

In country after country and in radically different cultures, a striking pattern emerges: the elites of the favored group

benefit, while those at the bottom, at whom the policies are presumably targeted, regress;

The preferences inevitably expand to cover new groups and wider areas, and as they do, group polarization increases. A backlash, often bloody, develops;

Preferences increase the risk of hiring marginal members of the preferred group by setting a floor under the qualifications employers require of minorities. This makes the less educated, the less skilled, and the less experienced members of the group a more risky gamble for an employer than they otherwise would be;

The policies tend to reinforce America's oldest myth, that white are superior to blacks, by mismatching talented minority students with colleges that demand more than they can deliver. Thus, more than 70 percent of the black students at the University of California at Berkeley fail to graduate, even though their academic performance is above the national average.

I urge my colleagues to read this article within the larger context of the growing number of respected black academicians and intellectuals—including Walter Williams, Shelby Steele, Clarence Thomas, William Allen, and William Lucas—who believe that preferential policies are inconsistent with the original goals of the American civil rights movement.

[From the Washington Times, June 26, 1990]

SCHOLAR STILL AFFIRMS PERIL OF RACE QUOTAS

(By Carolyn Lochhead)

Thomas Sowell was conspicuously absent when President Bush met recently with a group of activists of diverse races, sexes, religions, physical disabilities and other assorted traits. Mr. Bush wanted to discuss the Civil Rights Act of 1990, a bill speeding through Congress; the activists had threatened to boycott the confabulation had Mr. Sowell been invited. The White House acquiesced in the interests of peace, harmony and meaningful dialogue.

Mr. Sowell might have contributed a diversity of the mental sort. He chuckles at the consternation he causes among leaders of powerful organizations that enjoy easy political and media access. "They're worried about one man sitting in a little office out in California writing on a yellow pad," he says. "They don't feel themselves capable of countering what I might say."

The power of that writing on the yellow pad and the mind behind it can be judged by the fear they inspire. Long pilloried by the civil rights establishment, Mr. Sowell has throughout his career challenged conventional wisdom about racial policies and other dogmas.

He is a scholar at the Hoover Institution in California and a syndicated columnist whose work appears regularly in this newspaper. His latest book, "Preferential Policies: An International Perspective," is sure to provoke. This time Mr. Sowell examines racial and other group preferences—the application of different rules or standards to members of different groups—that have been imposed by governments around the world from affirmative action in the United States to apartheid in South Africa.

He also looks at preferences for far-flung groups such as India's untouchables, Nigeria's Hausa Fulani, New Zealand's Maori, Sri Lanka's Sinhalese and many others.

In country after country and in radically different cultures, a striking pattern emerges: the elites of the favored group benefit, while those at the bottom, at whom the policies are presumably targeted, regress. Discussions of the rationales and the hopes of the programs abound, with little thought paid to their actual results.

The preferences inevitably expand to cover new groups and wider areas, and as they do, group polarization increases. A backlash, often bloody, develops. Nigeria plunged into civil war. In Sri Lanka, a country that once had better race relations than the United States, Sinhalese mobs burned Tamil people alive in the streets.

"I see no reason why it can't happen here," Mr. Sowell says. Nothing is easier than to start a spiral of racial confrontations, he contends, "and nothing is harder than to stop it."

The United States has not yet traveled as far as other nations have in implementing preferential policies. "But if the current bill, the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1990," becomes law, he says, "we will have quotas set in concrete, no matter how much people deny it. And the hatred that is going to grow out of that is going to be something like we've never seen."

In the Bensonhurst section of New York City, whites murdered a black teen-ager in a racial attack last year; today in Brooklyn, a black demagogue hurls racial slurs at Korean grocers as the heirs to Little Rock watch in silence. On U.S. college campuses, the vanguard of affirmative action, Mr. Sowell says he sees the very trends beginning that have repeated themselves worldwide with disastrous results. White student unions are forming, and administrators react by suppressing speech. "The backlash has already begun," he says.

Born in a small town in Georgia some 60 years ago and raised in Harlem, Mr. Sowell is no stranger to the racism that preferences are intended to remedy. Always out of step with conventional wisdom, the economist was a Marxist during the height of McCarthyism and today is a classical liberal when "progressivism" is in vogue.

It is not Mr. Sowell's ideals that have changed since his youth, he says, but rather his understanding of how to achieve them. His concern lies not with intentions or hopes but with results, not with what a law declares it will achieve but the incentives it creates and the real consequences that follow.

Just as similar preferences have done in other countries, he says, affirmative action benefits elites at the expense of the less successful—fewer jobs for unskilled minorities so that minority engineers and scientists will be able to have "15 or 16 job offers instead of five or six."

Yet this possibility is almost never raised in the Kennedy-Hawkins debate, he says. "They're talking in terms of 'strengthening civil rights laws' and 'stopping the retreat from civil rights' and all sorts of vague statements of that sort about intentions and rationales, but without one speck of concern for the incentives they are creating."

Such incentives may account in part for the worldwide pattern of retrogression among the least advantaged group members even as the elites advance. Mr. Sowell argues that U.S. preferences especially increase the risk of hiring marginal members of the preferred group. Firms face a greater legal risk, for example, when firing a black female than a white male.

Mr. Sowell recalls a female academic who said she hires only "promotable" female assistant professors because she has "no time to waste at [Equal Opportunity Commission] hearings and in the courtroom." The preferences in this way set a floor under the qualifications employers require of minorities, he says, "making the less educated, the less skilled and the less experienced members of the group a more risky gamble for an employer than they would otherwise be."

The common wisdom holds that minorities need preferences in order to progress. Dogma, Mr. Sowell counters. Affirmative action often gets credit for trends already under way. "It is an often-cited statistic that the number of blacks in professional and other high-level occupations increased significantly after the Civil Rights Act of 1964," Mr. Sowell writes, "but it is an almost totally ignored fact that the number of blacks in such occupations increased even more rapidly in the years preceding passage" of the act.

Mr. Sowell vigorously attacks the widespread assumption—and the foundation of most civil rights law—that discrimination primarily causes statistical imbalances by occupation. "The fatal fallacy of 'affirmative action' policies," he writes, "is to assume as a norm a condition of even or random distribution of groups that is seldom, if ever, found on this planet."

Group disparities are the norm, he says, and proportional representation is the anomaly—not the reverse, as U.S. courts, regulators and lawmakers nearly always assume. Group over- or underrepresentation is commonplace throughout the world in almost any occupation or institution. Human beings do not produce statistically balanced results, Mr. Sowell argues. Even when employer practices are not involved, group disparities are common.

Age can heavily influence a group's statistical representation in everything from prison populations to university professorships. Discrimination may be found to statistically "explain" why some groups are underrepresented in certain areas, just as shoe size can statistically "explain" test scores on mathematics exams, he notes.

Undoubtedly a correlation exists, because toddlers cannot answer as many math questions as 40-year-olds. Nor is it likely, he points out, that groups concentrated in landlocked states would be evenly represented in maritime industries.

Yet the common remedy for group imbalances is to put groups where they would have been, but for the assumed discrimination. Such remedies, Mr. Sowell says, further assume knowledge that no one possesses. "What would the average Englishman be like today, 'but for' the Norman conquest? What would the Middle East be like 'but for' the emergence of Islam?" Such speculation nonetheless routinely forms the basis of group preferences, he says.

Once in place, preferences usually expand to cover more groups and more benefits. Preferences for India's untouchables now include groups that outnumber the untouchables, and it is estimated that two-thirds of the U.S. population belongs to a preferred group. "Clearly, no recitation of the historic oppressions suffered by blacks can justify preferences for white middle-class women," Mr. Sowell writes. In the meantime, the policies cast suspicion over their intended beneficiaries, he argues. The "dumb-jock" stereotype now has a racial counterpart.

More tragically, affirmative action has generated artificial failure among minority

students by mismatching them with colleges, Mr. Sowell contends. The pool of qualified candidates is too small to ensure proportional representation at all colleges; so when top universities, each competing for minority students, find that they cannot fill their quotas, they lower their admissions standards and siphon off students whose qualifications match the standards of second-rung institutions. These institutions in turn siphon students from still lower-tiered schools. At each step, students who might have succeeded at a school that matched their qualifications systematically drop out. More than 70 percent of the black students at the University of California at Berkeley, Mr. Sowell says, fail to graduate, even though their academic performance is above the national average.

The consequences are serious. San Jose State University Professor Shelby Steele wrote recently that such policies tend to reinforce "America's oldest myth, that whites are superior . . . that blacks are inferior."

Mr. Sowell first warned Americans 20 years ago that the conclusion people will draw from racial preferences is not that the programs have failed, but that blacks just cannot hack it. He is not optimistic about where it all may end. "There's a consolation in being as old as I am," he said recently. "I don't think that I'm going to live to see the terrible trends that are setting in, particularly in race relations, come to their conclusion. I certainly would not want to be here for that."

TRIBUTE TO WALTER L. ANDERSON

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal work force includes many exemplary and dedicated individuals who serve our Nation with honor and distinction. All of us who regularly interact with civil servants are well aware that a special few of them rise above even these high levels of achievement. Walter Anderson of the General Accounting Office is one of the special few.

Walter L. Anderson is retiring as the senior adviser in the Information Management and Technology Division. His retirement ends an era in GAO.

After serving as a naval electronics officer at the end of World War II, Walter Anderson completed his master's degree in electrical engineering education and became a computer pioneer. His experience includes Sperry UNIVAC and serving as national president of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies and chairman of the computer group of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers [IEEE]. Also, he was CEO of a company which made computer and electronics testing equipment.

Walter Anderson joined the GAO in 1974 after 28 years in the computer field in private industry. He was one of a key group of technical experts brought in by Comptroller General Elmer Staats to help GAO address ADP and telecommunications in Federal agencies. From 1974 through 1985, he was an associate director and senior associate director re-

sponsible for many GAO projects which had, and still have, great influence on Federal ADP and telecommunications. Walter headed up several GAO investigations which I commissioned as chairman of the House Government Operations Committee. His work included a report recommending cancellation of the Air Force phase IV procurement and redirection of the project, which alone saved the taxpayers \$800 million. Other reports to the Congress on governmentwide ADP problems significantly impacted the operations of the General Services Administration, Bureau of Standards, and the Office of Management and Budget, and included reports on Federal ADP standards and software contracting. The former caused redirection of, and increased budget for, the Government's ADP Standards Program; the latter was so well thought of by the professional community that it was selected for inclusion in a technical guidebook published by the IEEE.

Walter Anderson's honors and awards are numerous, including induction into the Government Computer News Hall of Fame in 1989, IEEE Centennial Medal for Extraordinary Achievement in 1984, and the GAO Distinguished Service Award in 1981.

Above all, Walter Anderson produced and supported workable Federal ADP solutions. His combined knowledge of computer science, practical data processing, procurement, and management reality is very rare and will be greatly missed by all of us.

In recognition of the high esteem in which he is held, and considering Walter's many contributions to the General Accounting Office, to the Congress, and to the Nation, I ask that this tribute be made a part of the RECORD of the House of Representatives.

KOREA—THE FORGOTTEN WAR

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, June 25, 1990, marked the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the Korean war and a day to remember those who sacrificed their lives to fight this war. There is nothing that I can say to match the eloquence of Richard Danielson, a World War II and Korean war veteran, vice president of the Korean War Veterans Association and also one of my constituents. At this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include a copy of his essay entitled "Korea—The Forgotten War." As you can see, Mr. Danielson speaks from the heart and captures the true spirit of those Americans who went to Korea.

KOREA—THE FORGOTTEN WAR

(By Richard Danielson)

Between the storied Allied triumphs of World War II and the trauma of Vietnam, a bitter military ordeal in Korea cost the lives of tens of thousands of Americans. Today millions of their countrymen are only dimly aware of the conflict.

Forty years ago, on June 25, 1950, the Korea War started and was halted by an armistice on July 27, 1953. It involved 22 na-

tions under the United Nations Sanction fighting together in defense of the Republic of Korea. There were 297,855 Allied Casualties which included 9,779 listed as missing and 400 prisoners who have not been accounted for after nearly 36 years.

More than 5.7 million Americans served during the conflict. Some 33,600 were killed in action, including about 8,200 listed as missing and presumed dead. Another 21,400 died of non-battle causes and more than 103,000 were wounded during the three years of war.

From the State of Ohio, there were 1,755 known casualties who died, including 301 who are listed as missing.

In the Greater Cleveland Area, there were 268 who died and 56 are listed as missing. Two Cleveland area brothers, Paul and Donald Dowling, captured at the Chosin Reservoir have not been accounted for on the official U.S. Military Casualties listed for the Korean War.

It was one of the most miserable wars the United States ever fought. The weather alone probably caused more casualties than the enemy. The war introduced to the world the term "brainwashing" in which many prisoners suffering physical and emotional hardship, underwent political indoctrination and assaults on their will and self-esteem. Of the 7,140 Americans captured or interned, only 4,418 were returned by the enemy at the end of the War.

Dubbed a "police action", it lacked the image of righteous crusade to which most past U.S. Wars have been evaluated. American troops fought as valiantly as ever, but conditions were never right for a complete victory. Some of the greatest heroics occur after difficult situations, such as the grinding 78-mile withdrawal from the Chosin Reservoir in December 1950. During this withdrawal, Allied ground troops incurred 4,400 battle casualties and 7,000 casualties due to bitter weather. During this time, nearly 100,000 North Korean refugees were evacuated by the American forces to freedom.

The United Nations forces, most of them Americans, stopped the Communist North Koreans from taking over the South. But Allied efforts to drive the aggressors North to the Manchurian border and reunite the divided nation under a pro-west government failed because of the intervention of the Chinese Forces.

In the end, the Armies were back where they had begun, on either side of the so-called demilitarized zone at the 38th parallel, which divided Korea into the Northern and Southern political entities established at the conclusion of World War II. Governments of both sides decided to work on an agreement to end the war. In this day of rapprochement with China, it is even impolite to talk about the war in which China was a principal adversary.

But the men and women who helped the South drive back the invasion from the North did succeed in one thing. They kept South Korea outside the Marxist Orbit and today it is one of the leading emerging industrial powers of the world.

With the North Koreans returning the remains of 5 U.S. Servicemen on May 27, 1990, after nearly 36 years, there is hope that peace will come for the people of Korea and there will be an end to the "Forgotten War—Korea".

THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this letter to the editor of the Washington Times regarding a June 12, article on the National Endowment for the Arts. The article distorts the nature of several artists' work, damaging both them personally and the community's faith in the National Endowment for the Arts. Such distortion and misinformation has been inflaming the already fiery debate surrounding the National Endowment for the Arts and violating artists' rights.

Yesterday, Artist David Wojnarowicz won a Federal suit against Rev. Donald Wildmon, the executive director of the American Family Association, for misrepresenting the artists' work. The American Family Association sent out a pamphlet to 6,000 people, including Members of Congress, members of the clergy and media outlets, illustrating 14 small details of the artist's larger works that were displayed in a gallery receiving some NEA grant money. The court held the pamphlet "could be seen as misrepresenting the work of the artist, with likely damage to the artist's reputation and to the value of his works." The court ruled that the pamphlet violated Wojnarowicz's rights under the New York Artists Authorship Rights Act, and might give off the impression "that the photographic reproductions included in the pamphlet represented complete works of art * * * as distinguished from fragments of larger works, as in most cases they were."

I encourage my colleagues to read this letter to the editor. We all must be wary of this campaign of misinformation and distortion—it is unfairly damaging a successful agency and the livelihood of artists involved.

BROOKLYN, NY,
June 20, 1990.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,
The Washington Times,
Washington, DC.

TO THE EDITOR: Divide and conquer: that would seem to be the strategy behind the article by George Archibald in your paper on June 12, 1990, alleging that John Frohnmayer, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts (N.E.A.), is trying to "kill five controversial solo-performance theater grants" recommended by peer panels. The publication of this unconfirmed rumor is an obvious attempt to drive a wedge through the community that supports an unrestricted arts endowment.

The article names three artists whose grant applications will supposedly be rejected because their work is controversial. It then proceeds to present a grossly distorted picture of that work, including outright falsehoods about its content. Taken completely out of context, descriptions of isolated moments in Karen Finley's work fail to make clear that, far from sensationally recreating and promoting violent sex acts, Finley presents a critique of a society in which sexual violence is a constant threat to women's lives. The suggestion that Molly Hughes engages in simulated sex acts on stage is just not true. Furthermore, using an

unattributed quote describing Hughes' focus as "lesbian desire" is a blatant attempt to capitalize on the homophobia which has partly fueled the movement to restrict the endowment. Perhaps in the future your researchers will go to the artists themselves for information about their work.

None of the sources for any of the allegations in the article are named. Who are the "agency and council officials" who, contrary to a 25-year-long policy of confidentiality, gave out names of artist applicants, labeled them "controversial," and allowed them to be publicly slandered simply because they applied for a grant? The winners of public grants will be public knowledge; but to single out controversial applicants for public vilification allows the N.E.A. granting process to be used as a kind of official blacklist. We saw this kind of thing in the 1940s and 1950s when artists were branded as Communists. We won't stand for it now.

The distortions of these artists' work are damaging to them personally, and to the community's faith in the endowment's granting process. An arts endowment that excludes artists because of their sexual orientation or social and political point of view, cloaking these exclusions in vague intimations of "obscenity," would be truly un-American.

We doubt that Chairman Frohnmayer or the N.E.A. staff would stoop to this kind of political scapegoating, even in a misguided attempt to preserve the arts endowment by appeasing its attackers. Such actions would be in direct violation of the N.E.A.'s Statement of Mission: to help create and sustain "a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination and inquiry."

JESSIE ALLEN (and Others).

IT'S TIME TO CARE ABOUT OUR ENVIRONMENT

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent letter I received last week from Mrs. Janice J. Hatler of Madisonville, KY.

Janice Hatler has eloquently expressed her concern for the environment and the apathetic attitude most Americans have toward keeping it clean. Furthermore, Janice Hatler rightly proclaims that environmental initiatives must come from Congress.

I urge my colleagues to read and consider her well-written letter. It follows in its entirety:

MADISONVILLE, KY,
June 15, 1990.

Congressman CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.,
U.S. Representative, Rayburn House Office,
Washington, DC.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD: The older I become, the more concerned I grow about our environment. Day after day, the news brings horror stories of the multitude of abuses that plague the oceans and rivers, predictions of global warming and its consequences, and the critical situation with our country's landfills.

I am writing to you to urge you to become more conscientious of the environment as our representative in Congress. To urge you to do what is right for the betterment of the

environment, not what benefits corporate executive's billfolds.

Personally, I feel Americans must alter their way of living. We have been living the "high life" if you will, for long enough. We citizens of the United States are very lucky. Every convenience and luxury are at our fingertips. Unfortunately though, this has been at the expense of our precious environment.

The vast majority of Americans are not willingly going to change their lifestyles. So the changes must come from you, that is, from Congress and legislation. Why not have mandatory recycling of our used products—glass, plastic, and paper—from every city in this country? Why not initiate a massive campaign of tree planting that provides tax exemption with so many acres planted? All of our efforts towards preserving the earth are so essential to our continued existence as a species. Every person in America must begin to care more. And the industrial giants are not exempted. Stricter and tighter restrictions and penalties must be enforced for the careless and purposeful dumping of waste into the earth. It is imperative that we begin to stop the deterioration of our environment.

I beseech you to become more concerned and create those laws that will enable us all to live in a world that is less abused and cluttered with our human waste.

Sincerely,

JANICE J. HATLER.

TRUE MEANING OF FREEDOM ESCAPES NELSON MANDELA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this is a truly historic occasion. This is only the third time in our Nation's history that we have allowed a foreign private citizen to address a joint meeting of Congress. In 1824, this honor was bestowed upon the Marquis de Lafayette, who served the cause of American independence, during which time he became a close friend of George Washington, the father of our country. Lech Walesa, the much admired leader of the Solidarity movement in Poland, was the second private citizen to address both bodies in a joint meeting. In fact, at the presentation of the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Mr. Walesa during his visit in 1989, President Bush compared his efforts on behalf of the people of Poland to those of the Marquis de Lafayette:

... like him [the Marquis de Lafayette], you represent not only a people but also an idea—an idea whose time has come. That idea is freedom. The time is now.

Today, Nelson Mandela, deputy president of the African National Congress [ANC], has joined the ranks of these genuinely great men. But does he stand for the same freedoms as the Marquis de Lafayette and Lech Walesa? I am afraid to say, he does not. While there is little doubt that Mr. Mandela is committed to the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, he clearly has little or no understanding of the true meaning of freedom.

Nelson Mandela, who claims to stand for the freedom and independence of black South Africa, has a history of supporting terrorism, even when it involves violence against innocent civilians. In fact, since his release from prison, the Marxist-dominated ANC has been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of innocents. Furthermore, it is difficult not to question the sincerity of a man who himself has conceded that his organization is responsible for the torture and execution of some of its own members who tried to exercise their freedom of choice by breaking ties with the ANC.

Nelson Mandela's ignorance of the true meaning of freedom is further exemplified by the number of comments he has made throughout his trip to the United States praising the leadership of such notorious human rights violators as Fidel Castro, Yasser Arafat, and Mir'ammah Qadhafi. If Mr. Mandela envisions a new South Africa using these people as role models, clearly blacks in that country have nothing to gain and everything to lose under ANC leadership.

While our Founding Fathers were quick to realize that personal freedom is difficult to realize without economic freedom, Nelson Mandela has not seen the light. Despite the fact that the folly of communism has finally been realized throughout much of Eastern Europe, as well as in parts of Africa itself, Mr. Mandela continues to ignore the economic irrationality of a socialist economic system. He has stated that the "nationalization of the mines, the financial institutions and monopoly industries is the fundamental policy of the ANC and it is inconceivable that we will ever change this policy." Clearly, there is indeed expected to be some confusion on the part of our constituents when, on the one hand, the United States Congress hails a man like Lech Walesa who was instrumental in bringing democracy to Poland through the dismantling of the Stalinist economic system, and on the other hand heaps praise on Nelson Mandela, who, if given the opportunity, would implement the very same policies Lech Walesa fought to eradicate.

Mr. Mandela claims that United States sanctions imposed against South Africa in 1986 are largely responsible for his release as well as the many other remarkable changes which have occurred in that country over recent months. Further, he has publicly called for stronger sanctions stating that they would likely bring greater improvements. The fact of the matter is, however, that these historic steps, such as lifting the state of emergency, reforming the state security system, abolishing hospital and other forms of segregation, releasing political prisoners, and rescinding the prohibition on the ANC, have all taken place on the heels of the election of President de Klerk, nearly 3 years after U.S. sanctions first went into effect.

It is highly unlikely that our sanctions had anything to do with Mr. de Klerk's actions. In fact, it can be argued that sanctions have actually hurt the struggle to end apartheid by increasing the economic might of the white minority while undercutting the economic power of the blacks. Since the imposition of sanc-

tions, most American firms sold their subsidiaries to white South Africans at fire-sale prices. In many instances, the new owners responded by laying off blacks and abolishing the many progressive work rules, educational programs, and fair pay which blacks had come to expect from their American employers.

While the light at the end of the tunnel is visible to so many, Mr. Mandela cannot see it because, along with the ANC, he is seeking more than simply one man, one vote.

I, frankly, am dismayed by the extent to which many of my conservative colleagues, as well as the administration, have embraced Mr. Mandela during his trip here. Truly, this strong show of support is clearly uncalled for, especially in light of the fact that Mr. Mandela showed absolutely no regard for this body when he hailed as comrades the four Puerto Rican gunmen who opened fire in the House Chamber in 1954, wounding five of our colleagues.

TRIBUTE TO THE FORT WORTH SISTER CITIES PROGRAM

HON. PETE GEREN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during this tumultuous and glorious period in world history, with walls of oppression crumbling all over the globe and people in the farthest corners of the Earth risking everything for the cause of freedom, the mission envisioned by President Eisenhower for his Sister Cities Program has never held more meaning nor been more important. Our country, our traditions, our values and our symbols have inspired countless millions with hope for a better life for themselves and for their children.

We have a duty to extend our hand of friendship to those millions. President Eisenhower saw his Sister Cities Program as one of the ways we could do just that. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the city of Fort Worth, TX, has shared in that mission and this year was recognized with the Reader's Digest Award for having the best Sister Cities Program in the Nation for a city its size. Fort Worth, the city "where the West begins," prides itself in its friendliness, its openness, and its commitment to community service. It has taken the spirit of Sister Cities to heart and has joined with Reggio Emilia, Italy; Trier, West Germany; Nagasaki, Japan; Bandung, Indonesia; and just this week, Budapest, Hungary.

Today, I ask Congress to join me in commending the citizens of Fort Worth and the Fort Worth Sister Cities Program for their receipt of the Reader's Digest Award as the one of the best in America and for their commitment to the cause of international understanding and world peace. They are a part of the constellation of our country's thousand points of light.

MANDELA PRAISE OF QADHAFI, CASTRO, AND ARAFAT WRONG

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, in light of Mr. Nelson Mandela's visit to the United States and his address today before a joint session of Congress, I would like to bring to your attention the following petition. The signatures you find at the end of this document are the names of five mayors of south Florida cities including the mayor of Miami who have signed their names to actively oppose the visit of Nelson Mandela to our country. I believe it is important to recognize the fact that Mandela has publicly supported such current leaders as Yassir Arafat, Fidel Castro, and Mu'ammar Qadhafi whose violations of human rights have been denounced not only in this country but worldwide. He has also refused to renounce violence in the pursuit of his goals in South Africa. As people throughout the United States celebrate the arrival of Nelson Mandela and greet him with a hero's welcome in cities around the country, I feel compelled to not only state my own opposition to his views with regard to Qadhafi, Castro, and Arafat, but to make public the opposition of other individuals who have been betrayed by Mandela's praise of these human rights violators.

The petition reads as follows:

We, the undersigned Cuban-American elected officials, grateful for all the liberties and freedoms embodied in our democratic political system, hereby once more repudiate and condemn the inhumanity and shamefulfulness of apartheid, and support the aspirations of all black South Africans who wish a free and more democratic society.

In accordance with the above, we condemn all violations of human rights perpetrated against black South Africans for their rightful and simple aspirations. These violations of human rights have been exceedingly documented in all types of international forums through individual and institutional testimonies. However, these violations are not carried out exclusively by the government of South Africa; other governments habitually violate their citizens' human rights of which the present Cuban regime is the most prominent.

In view of these facts, we, Cuban-Americans, find it beyond reasonable comprehension that Mr. Nelson Mandela, a victim of so many years of oppression by his own government, not only fails to condemn the Cuban government for its human rights violations, but rather praises the virtues of the tyrannical Castro regime. This behavior is unacceptable now that said regime has been publicly condemned by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights based in Geneva, Switzerland. Rather than supporting the oppressors and violators of human rights, Mr. Mandela should support those whose human rights are being violated in Cuba.

We congratulate Mr. Mandela on his newly acquired freedom. We condemn his support of human rights violations in Cuba. Lastly, we do not understand how a human rights violator like South Africa has freed Mr. Mandela, and the United States, a beacon of freedom, continues to hold Dr. Orlando Bosch incarcerated without legal

justification. We demand Dr. Orlando Bosch's freedom.

JULIO MARTINEZ,
Mayor of Hialeah.

JUAN A. RIVERO,
Mayor of Sweetwater.

PEDRO REBOREDO,
Mayor of West Miami.

GILDA OLIVERA,
Mayor of Hialeah Gardens.

XAVIER SUAREZ,
Mayor of Miami.

TRIBUTE TO ST. ANN'S MELKITE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF WEST PATERSON, NJ, ON ITS HOSTING THE 31ST MELKITE CONVENTION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest reverence and the greatest sense of pride that I rise today to salute an outstanding house of worship and parish community in my Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey which has been a spiritual focal point and a beacon of faith for countless numbers of worshippers in the greater northern New Jersey area.

I am speaking of St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church of West Paterson, NJ, which is host to the 31st Melkite Convention. This proud and historic occasion will culminate on July 7, 1990, at the grand banquet which will celebrate the achievements of the convention and the first century of the Melkite Church in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the history of St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church is indeed a rich one. For the benefit of you and our colleagues, I would like to insert for the RECORD the history of this truly fine and respected house of worship:

It all began at the turn of the century, when a large number of Syrian immigrants began to arrive in this country from Aleppo, Damascus, and Lebanon. With a devotion to their ancestry and tradition, they were served in the early days of their migration, by visiting Melkite priests who held services in Paterson and Union City.

As the Melkite congregation grew, the need for a permanent place of worship became apparent. On June 9, 1921, Metropolitan Maximao Sayegh of Tyre blessed the site of the future church, the O'Neill estate on Mill Street in Paterson, New Jersey, and in April 1922 groundbreaking ceremonies took place and work started immediately. Msgr. Sheppard, vicar general of the diocese of Newark, blessed the church on December 8, 1922. Construction of the new church was completed by December 8, 1932, the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the first church, the New St. Ann's Church was solemnly blessed. The new church was to be called St. Ann's, in respect to the mother of Mary and grandmother of Jesus.

The church grew rapidly and thrived in spite of the Depression and throughout World War II. Even though parishioners

moved to new communities, they remained loyal to St. Ann's Church. Their loyalty was put to a true test on August 28, 1970, the day the church was gutted by a devastating fire that completely destroyed the church.

Shortly before 3:00 a.m., fire broke out in St. Ann's Byzantine Melkite Catholic Church, at that time the only place of worship for Melkite Christians in the State of New Jersey. Spectacular flames soared 60 feet high into the air. By 3:15 a.m., the fire had grown to a fourth alarm. The granite figure of St. Ann looked down calmly as firemen fought the blaze and parishioners and friends wept at the loss. Two hours later, everything was gone—the church and its treasures were destroyed. Another era for St. Ann's had ended.

Since a church is more than a building, the people of St. Ann's immediately transformed the parish auditorium into a church and included an inconstancy. For the next several years, this became the place of worship, while the clergy and committees studied alternatives and decided to relocate in suburban West Paterson, NJ.

Groundbreaking for the new church was held in 1972. Under the expert guidance of the clergy and parishioners, the necessary committees were formed to work on the new complex and all it entailed. The 1973 Christmas liturgy was celebrated in the bare church. During construction of the new church, St. Ann's Church celebrated its golden anniversary. The church not only celebrated 50 years of service and commitment to the community, but celebrated a new beginning in its new location. Solemn dedication of the new complex took place in December 1974. The parishioners' resolve held out and a new church was built in West Paterson, NJ by December 1974. Currently, the new church thrives in its new location serving the parishioners and the community.

The bicentennial year of 1976 brought to our diocese and our country the Icon of Our Lady of America, dedicated by His Beatitude Maximos V. Hakim. This icon was a pilgrimage icon traveling to the faithful in many States until it was stolen from the church in 1977. Through the constant and solemn prayers of the parishioners, the icon was returned and has been enshrined at St. Ann's ever since.

On July 6, 1989, the Episcopal ordination of Nicholas J. Samra, pastor of St. Ann's took place. Not only was he the pastor, but he was a parish son. This was a day which was truly one of the greatest in the 70-year history of the wonderful community. Bishop Nicholas was named auxiliary bishop of the Midwest region of the diocese, with residence in Detroit, Michigan. This was later changed to bishop of the East region and rector of the St. Gregory Seminary with his residence in Boston.

The St. Ann's community has been truly blessed by the ordination of three parish sons to the priesthood. Nicholas J. Samra, Basil Samra, and Kenneth Sherman have all entered the priesthood to help others and guide people spiritually, values promulgated by the church and its community. Another parish son, Michael Jolly, was ordained deacon to serve the St. Ann community. The following clergy are those who served with a full commitment and love of the community of St. Ann: Fr. Cyril Anid, 1919; Fr. Joseph Raya, 1949; Fr. Maxim Chalhoub, 1953; Fr. Gabriel Dick, 1953; Fr. Albert Gorayeb, 1963; Deacon Basil Samra, 1973; Fr. Roman Obrycki, 1976; Fr. Alphonse Stevenson, 1976; Fr. Joseph For-

tuna, 1977; Fr. Mark Melone, 1978; Fr. Nicholas Antiba, 1978; Fr. Paul Frechette, 1978; Fr. James Babcock, 1981; Fr. Nicholas Samra, 1981; Deacon Michael Jolly, 1986; Deacon Edward Bsarany, 1987; Deacon Roland Basinski, 1987; Fr. Philip Raczk, 1989; Fr. Basil Adcock, 1989; and Fr. Albert Wehbe, 1989.

If you can dream, then you can be. We Melkites have had many dreams throughout our diocese, throughout our parishes, and throughout St. Ann's. As our dreams became a reality we grew. We must keep on growing. We here at St. Ann's are indeed fortunate and honored to host the 31st National Melkite Convention and celebrating a century of the Melkite Church in America. This is a true sign of growth in our diocese.

We will dream on as we have gloriously for the last 100 years. Our future is bright? and our goals are many. Our community life and unity has strengthened us for 70 years at St. Ann's. We will continue on as long as we accept the challenge of our dreams. We will live in the Glory of God and then as men we will be fully alive.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present the history of this distinguished church that has remained dedicated to helping others and guiding them spiritually. As St. Ann's Melkite Catholic Church hosts the 31st Melkite Convention and celebrates a century of the Melkite Church in America, I know that you and all of our colleagues here in Congress will want to join me in extending our warmest greetings and sincere appreciation for both the service and guidance it has provided for the community, State, and Nation.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1990

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the House of Representatives Election Campaign Reform Act of 1990. This bill makes a number of fundamental changes to the way in which congressional campaigns are conducted, especially in the area of campaign finance.

Over the last few years there has been increasing concern across the country that political action committees [PAC's], through their contributions, have come to wield extraordinary influence on how the Congress conducts its business. Personally, I believe these concerns, on the whole, are unfounded. Nevertheless, in order to govern effectively, it is essential that the public have confidence in the integrity of the legislative process.

Today, that confidence has been shaken. Regardless of our personal views on the issue, it is clear, that in order for many Americans to regain their trust of the process, we in Congress must make fundamental changes in ways campaigns are financed and in the overall role played by PAC's.

Earlier this year I entered into the RECORD an article written by Mr. Norman J. Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, which appeared in Roll Call. In that article, Mr. Ornstein

made a number of recommendations for provisions in a campaign finance reform bill. As I indicated at that time, I have drawn on many of the insights and proposals contained in that article in drafting this legislation.

My bill restores public trust and confidence in our system in several ways. First, it would reduce the maximum amount a PAC may contribute to a candidate for the House of Representatives from the current \$5,000 to \$2,000.

Second, this legislation would increase the reliance of House candidates on smaller contributions from individuals from their own States.

Third, by limiting personal contributions or loans by candidates or their families to \$100,000, the bill checks the increasingly disturbing and growing trend of wealthy candidates spending vast sums of their own personal money to, as some have contended, attempt to "buy the election."

Fourth, it provides candidates who are the victims of "independent expenditures" with the means to effectively counter this increasing practice of special interests attempting to pervert the election process.

Fifth, the legislation attempts to elevate the dialog of campaigns by requiring broadcast stations to offer their lowest rates to candidates who purchase time in 1-to-5 minute segments, rather than continuing to use the 30-second "hit-and-run" tactics which have become all too common in today's campaigns.

Sixth, the bill provides that candidates for the House may not establish or maintain campaign committees other than their authorized campaign committee. Where these additional committees currently exist, they are rarely established for the purpose of financing the campaigns of their founders. Instead, they are most commonly used by incumbent Congressmen to enhance their stature with their colleagues in Congress by serving as a vehicle to make campaign contributions.

Finally, the bill contains stiff criminal penalties for violations of its provisions.

Each of these items is important to restoring the public's trust in the way campaigns and the legislative process operate. However, the cornerstone of this package is the elevation of the importance of smaller contributions from individuals from the candidates' home States. My bill accomplishes this in several ways.

First, it provides a 100-percent tax credit for the first \$200 an individual contributes to a campaign.

Second, the bill allows individuals to check off on their tax returns a contribution of \$2 to a House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund.

Third, the trust fund would provide candidates with matching funds for the first \$200 in contributions from individuals, up to a maximum of \$300,000. To be eligible for matching funds, candidates must first raise at least \$25,000 from individuals from their State in amounts of \$200 or less, and agree to limit the use of their personal funds to \$100,000.

Fourth, a portion of any excess campaign funds a candidate may have following the election must be returned to the trust fund in the pro rata share that trust fund moneys accounted for of the total receipts of the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out that this bill does not limit the total amount which can be spent on a campaign for Congress. As much as I understand and sympathize with this objective of some of my colleagues, I am concerned that any number we might select would be arbitrary and inappropriate in some cases.

There is no question that it costs much more to run for a seat in Congress from New York City than it does to run a comparable campaign for a seat from northeastern Pennsylvania. Limiting the amount that can be spent on a campaign would unavoidably result in either too much, or too little being allowed, depending on the level and the seat involved.

Instead by significantly reducing the role of PAC's, establishing an upper limit on matching payments, limiting the amount of a candidate's personal funds in a campaign, and making television and radio rates for longer campaign messages more affordable, I believe this bill will result in less campaign spending while elevating the quality of campaign dialogs.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take significant steps to restore trust and faith to our campaign system. For this reason I salute your commitment and dedication to bringing this issue to the House floor for action. I believe that this legislation contains vital elements which should be in any final package adopted by this body and I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HON. PAUL KANJORSKI'S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1990

Section 1. Short title—The Act may be cited as the "House of Representatives Election Campaign Reform Act of 1990".

Section 2. Limitation on contributions to House of Representatives candidates by political action committees—Reduces from \$5,000 to \$2,000 the maximum contribution a political action committee may make to a candidate per election.

Section 3. Credit for contributions to congressional campaigns—Provides a 100% tax credit for the first \$200 (or \$400 in the case of a joint tax return) in personal contributions an individual makes to a House candidate running from the same state.

Section 4. Designation of income tax payments to the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund—Provides for a \$2 tax check-off on individual federal tax returns to be paid to the "House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund."

Section 5. Establishment of the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund—Creates a House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under the Secretary of the Treasury to receive funds derived from the \$2 check-off on individual tax returns and authorizes expenditures from the trust fund to certified candidates who have raised not less than \$25,000 in contributions of \$200 or less from individual contributors from their states.

Section 6. Amendment to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 relating to reporting of individual resident contributions in elections for the office of representative—Requires House candidates to report to the FEC when they have raised more than \$25,000 in contributions of \$200 or less from individuals residing in their states and requires the FEC to certify this to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 7. Amendment to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 relating to matching payments from the House of Representatives campaign trust fund—

(a) Entitles House candidates to matching funds from the trust fund for the first \$200 in contributions from individuals who reside in the state.

(b) Limits maximum total aggregate matching payments to \$300,000.

(c) In order to receive the matching payments, House candidates are required to certify, under penalty of perjury, that neither they, nor their family, shall furnish more than \$100,000 in personal funds or loans for the campaign.

Establishes penalties of up to \$25,000 in fines and/or 5 years in prison for violations of any certification that a candidate will not exceed \$100,000 in personal funds.

(d) Provides that if a candidate for the House refuses to make a certification that he/she will not spend over \$100,000 in personal funds, that candidate's opponents may receive matching funds for up to \$1,000 in contributions from individuals regardless of their state of residence.

(e) Allows opponents of a House candidate, who violates a certification to limit personal spending to \$100,000, to receive from the trust fund payments equal to the amount of personal funds contributed by the violating candidate in excess of \$100,000.

(f) Permits certified House candidates who are the target of independent expenditures which exceed \$10,000 to receive from the trust fund an amount equal to 300% of the amount of the independent expenditure. Persons found to have willfully or intentionally sought to subvert the intent of subsection may be fined up to \$25,000 and/or imprisoned for up to 5 years.

(g) Requires the repayment to the trust fund of a portion of any excess campaign funds after the election in an amount equal to the pro rata share that trust fund payments accounted for of the candidate's total aggregated receipts from all sources for the election. Repayments to the trust fund shall not exceed the total amount received from the trust fund.

(h) Requires the FEC to issue regulations to biennially index the provisions of subsection (a).

Section 8. Amendments to section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 with respect to independent expenditures—Requires the reporting to the FEC, within 24 hours, of any independent expenditures in a House race which exceeds \$10,000, and a statement as to which candidate the independent expenditures are intended to help or hurt. Requires the FEC to notify each candidate of the independent expenditures within 24 hours.

Section 9. Amendment Relating to Broadcast Media Rates and Disclosures—

(a) Requires broadcast stations to offer their lowest rates to House qualifying candidates who have agreed to limit personal spending to \$100,000, for commercials which are 1 to 5 minutes in length.

(b) Requires the inclusion of the statement "This candidate has not agreed to abide by the spending limits for this Congressional election campaign set forth in the Federal Election Campaign Act" in any broadcast or print advertisements of House candidates who refuse to agree to limit personal spending to \$100,000.

Section 10. Penalties—Makes it unlawful to furnish false information to, or to withhold information from, the FEC, punishable

by up to \$10,000 in fines and/or up to 5 years in prison.

Section 11. Restrictions on Control of Certain Types of Political Committees by Candidates—Prohibits House candidates from establishing, maintaining, or controlling a political committee other than an authorized committee of the candidate.

Section 12. Authorization of Appropriations—Authorizes such sums as are necessary to carry out the Act.

Section 13. Effective Date—Provides for the provisions of the Act to take effect after December 31, 1990.

Section 14. Severability—If any provision of the Act is held to be invalid, this will not affect the other provisions of the Act.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "House of Representatives Election Campaign Reform Act of 1990".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CANDIDATES BY POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES.

Section 315(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking out "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,000".

SEC. 3. CREDIT FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting a new section 24 as follows:

"SEC. 24. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGNS

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed, subject to the limitations of subsection (b), as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter, an amount equal to 100 percent of any congressional contribution which is made by such individual within the taxable year, as defined in subsection (c)(1).

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) The credit allowed by subsection (a) for a taxable year shall not exceed an aggregate of \$200 (\$400 in the case of a joint return) for all congressional contributions by an individual in said year.

"(2) The credit under subsection (a) shall not be allowed with respect to a congressional contribution, if the contribution is transmitted to the candidate or a campaign committee of the candidate through an intermediary group, organization, or committee.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(1) The term 'congressional contribution' means a contribution or gift of money, payment of which is made during the taxable year, to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States in any primary, general, or special election, and which—

"(A) is from a taxpayer (or either spouse in the case of a joint return) who is a resident of the State in which the election is held; and

"(B) is solely for the use by the recipient to further his candidacy for nomination or election to such office.

"(2) The term 'candidate' means an individual who—

"(A) publicly announces before the close of the calendar year in which the contribution or gift is made that he is a candidate for nomination or election to one of the offices specified in paragraph (1); and

"(B) meets the qualifications prescribed by law to hold such office."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 23 the following new item:

"Sec. 24. Contributions to Congressional Campaigns."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after December 31, 1990, in taxable years ending after that date.

(d) The Federal Election Commission shall issue regulations providing for the biennial indexing of the tax credit established under this section.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to returns and records) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART IX.—DESIGNATION OF INCOME TAX PAYMENTS TO BE USED FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND

"Sec. 6097. Designation by individuals.

"SEC. 6097. DESIGNATION BY INDIVIDUALS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Every individual whose adjusted income tax liability for the taxable year is \$2 or more may designate that \$2 shall be paid over to the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund.

"(b) ADJUSTED INCOME TAX LIABILITY.—For purposes of this section, the adjusted income tax liability of an individual is the tax liability of such individual (as determined under subsection (b) of section 6096) for the taxable year reduced by the amount designated under section 6096 (relating to designation of income tax payments to Presidential Election Campaign Fund) for such taxable year.

"(c) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return showing adjusted income tax liability of \$2 or more, each spouse may designate that \$2 shall be paid over to the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund.

"(d) MANNER AND TIME OF DESIGNATION.—Subsection (c) of section 6096 shall apply to the manner and time of the designation under this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for such subchapter A is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Part IX. Designation of income tax payments to be used for the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1990.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to Trust Fund Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 9511. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND

"(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund', consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such trust fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

"(b) TRANSFER TO FUND OF AMOUNTS DESIGNATED BY INDIVIDUALS.—There is hereby appropriated to the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the amounts designated under section 6097.

"(c) EXPENDITURE FROM FUND.—Amounts in the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund shall be available to provide matching payments in accordance with section 325 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. Expenditures from the Fund shall be made, in such manner as the Federal Election Commission may prescribe by regulation, to each candidate who certifies to the Commission that—

"(1) the candidate and the authorized committees of the candidate have received contributions totaling not less than \$25,000, in contributions of \$200 or less from individual contributors who are residents of the State from which the candidate is running for nomination or election to the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subchapter A is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 9511. House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund."

SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971 RELATING TO REPORTING OF INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT CONTRIBUTIONS IN ELECTIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"REPORTING OF INDIVIDUAL RESIDENT CONTRIBUTIONS IN ELECTIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE

"SEC. 324. (a) Each primary election or general election candidate for the Office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States who desires to receive matching payments under section 325 shall report to the Commission all contributions received by the candidate and the authorized committees of the candidate totaling not less than \$25,000, in contributions of \$200 or less from individual contributors who are residents of the State from which the candidate is running for nomination or election to the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States.

"(b) For purposes of making matching payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund, the Commission shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts reported under subsection (a)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to elections taking place after December 31, 1990.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971 RELATING TO MATCHING PAYMENTS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), as amended by section 6, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"MATCHING PAYMENTS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CAMPAIGN TRUST FUND

"SEC. 325. (a) ELIGIBILITY FOR MATCHING FUNDS.—A primary election or general elec-

tion candidate for the office of Representative who, under section 324, reports to the Commission that the candidate and the authorized committees of the candidate have received contributions totaling at least \$25,000, in contributions of \$200 or less from individual contributors who are residents of the State from which the candidate is running, shall be entitled to matching payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in an amount equal to the aggregate total of the first \$200 in contributions from individuals who are residents of the State from which the candidate is running.

"(b) MAXIMUM MATCHING BENEFIT.—The aggregate total of matching payments a primary election or general election candidate may receive as provided under subsection (a) shall not exceed \$300,000 in any election.

"(c) RESTRICTION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR MATCHING FUNDS.—

"(1) A primary election or general election candidate for the office of Representative who, under subsection (a) would qualify for matching funds must certify to the Commission, under penalty of perjury, that neither the candidate nor any members of the candidate's family, will furnish (by contribution, loan, or otherwise) from the personal funds of the candidate or the candidate's family an aggregate amount exceeding \$100,000 with respect to the election.

"(2) Any person who violates the provisions of paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$25,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both. Any officer, employee, or agent of any political committee who knowingly consents to any expenditure in violation of the provisions of paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$25,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(3) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'candidate's family' means an individual who is related to the candidate as father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, grandfather, grandmother, grandson, granddaughter, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, grandfather-in-law, grandmother-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half brother, or half sister.

"(d) ADDITIONAL MATCHING FUNDS. If a candidate refuses to make the certification required under subsection (c), all other candidates eligible under subsection (a), with respect to that primary or general election, shall be entitled to matching payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in an amount equal to the total of all contributions they receive from individuals regardless of State of residence of the contributors and for amounts up to \$1,000.

"(e) COMPENSATION TO OPPONENTS OF CANDIDATES WHO VIOLATE THE PERSONAL FUNDS LIMITATION CERTIFICATION.—If a candidate is found under subsection (c)(2) to have violated the provisions of subsection (c)(1), all other candidates eligible under subsection (a), with respect to that primary or general election, shall be entitled to payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in an amount equal to the amount in excess of \$100,000 as provided under subsection (c)(1).

"(f) INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES OFFSET.—

"(1) If a candidate certified under subsection (c) is notified by the Commission, as

provided under section 304 (d) or (e) of the Federal Election Campaign Act (2 U.S.C. 434) that independent expenditures are made during an election cycle by one or more person or entity aggregating an amount in excess of \$10,000 in opposition to such certified candidate or for an opponent of such candidate, the notified candidate shall be entitled to payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in an amount equal to 300 percent of the amount of such independent expenditures.

"(2) Any person or entity found by the Commission to have willfully or intentionally sought to subvert the intent of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$25,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(g) REPAYMENT OF TRUST FUND FROM EXCESS FUNDS.—

"(1) If at the conclusion of a primary election or general election in which a candidate who has received payments from the House of Representatives Campaign Trust Fund under section 9511 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 has excess campaign funds attributable to that election, such candidate shall within 30 days refund to the trust fund the amount of the excess campaign funds which equals the pro rata share that payments provided to such candidate from the trust fund accounted for of such candidate's total aggregated receipts from all sources with respect to such election.

"(2) In no case shall the amount of refund required under paragraph (1) exceed the total aggregated payments provided to such candidate from the trust fund with respect to that election.

"(h) INDEXING REGULATION.—The Federal Election Commission shall issue regulations providing for the biennial indexing of the provisions of subsections (a) and (b)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to elections taking place after December 31, 1990.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 304 OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971 WITH RESPECT TO INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d)(1) Any independent expenditures made, or obligated to be made, by any person or entity in an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress which in the aggregate total more than \$10,000 shall be reported by such person or entity to the Commission within 24 hours after such independent expenditures are made. Thereafter, any independent expenditures by such person or entity in the same election cycle shall be reported by such persons or entity to the Commission within 24 hours after such expenditures are made or obligated.

"(2) Such statements shall be filed with the Commission and the Secretary of State for the State involved and shall contain a statement under penalty of perjury by the person or entity making the independent expenditures, or by the person or entity incurring the obligation to make such expenditures, as the case may be, indicating whom the independent expenditures are actually intended to help elect or defeat. The Commission shall notify each candidate in the election of each such report within 24 hours after the report is made.

"(3) Notwithstanding the reporting requirements established in this paragraph, the Commission may make its own determination that a person or entity has made, or has incurred obligations to make, independent expenditures with respect to any election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress which in the aggregate totals more than \$10,000.

"(4) The Commission shall notify each candidate in the election about each such determination within 24 hours after each such determination is made.

"(5) For purposes of this section, an expenditure will be deemed to be made when it is incurred.

"(e) When two or more persons or entities, in cooperation, consultation, or concert with each other, make, or obligate to make, independent expenditures during any general, primary, or runoff election period for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress each such person or entity shall report to the Commission, under subsection (d), the amount of such expenditure or expenditures made by each such person or entity in coordination, consultation, or concert with such other person, persons, entity, or entities when the total amount of all expenditures made by such persons or entities in coordination, consultation, or concert with each other exceeds the applicable amount provided in such subsection."

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO BROADCAST MEDIA RATES AND DISCLOSURES.

(a) Section 315(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Provided, however, That in the case of a candidate who has made the certification required under section 325(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied without regard to the phrase 'class and' if the unit is at least 1 but not more than 5 minutes in length."

(b) Section 318(a) of the Federal Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441d(a)), is amended by—

(1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph 3 and inserting in lieu thereof ";; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) if paid for or authorized by a candidate in an election for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress who is a candidate, or the authorized committee of such candidate, who has not made the certification required under section 325(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, such communication shall also contain—

"(A) in the case of a radio broadcast station the following oral, or

"(B) in the case of a television broadcast state the following oral and printed, or

"(C) in the case of a newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, direct mailing, or any other type of general public political advertising the following printed sentence: 'This candidate has not agreed to abide by the spending limits for this Congressional election campaign set forth in the Federal Election Campaign Act.'"

SEC. 10. PENALTIES.

(a) It is unlawful for any person knowingly and willfully—

(1) to furnish any false, fictitious, or fraudulent evidence, books, or information (including any certification, verification, notice, or report) to the Commission under this Act, or to include in any evidence,

books, or information so furnished any misrepresentation of a material fact, or to falsify or conceal any evidence, books, or information relevant to a certification by the Commission under this Act; or,

(2) to fail to furnish to the Commission any records, books, or information requested by it for purposes of this Act.

(b) Any person who violates the provisions of paragraph (a)(1) shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 11. RESTRICTIONS ON CONTROL OF CERTAIN TYPES OF POLITICAL COMMITTEES BY CANDIDATES.

Section 303 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 432) is amended by adding at the end of the following:

"(j) A candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States may not establish, maintain, or control a political committee, other than an authorized committee of the candidate or a committee of a political party."

SEC. 12. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, this Act shall take effect after December 31, 1990.

SEC. 14. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made to this Act, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of any other such provision, and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WILLIAMSPORT ROTARY

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an arm of an extraordinary organization that I am proud to say is in my congressional district.

The Williamsport Rotary in Pennsylvania is celebrating its 75th anniversary. That means only 5 years after the Rotary was established on a national level, the group was born in Williamsport. Throughout the decades, the organization has done stellar work in the community. It brought the Boy Scouts to Williamsport, it started the Crippled Children's Society and has consistently striven to increase tourism in this beautiful part of Pennsylvania.

With a membership of 90 people, comprised primarily of educators, business people, clergy members and other civic-minded citizens, the Rotary is highly visible in the Williamsport area. Most recently, the group is focusing on establishing a transitional home for women and children. This, like all the Rotary's projects, is a fine and worthy goal.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes life can seem difficult and overwhelming. In those times, organizations like the Rotary provide kindness and strength to the community. America is a better place because of the Rotary, and for 75

years, Williamsport has been a better place for its local chapter.

On behalf of my constituents, I thank the Rotary members for their work. Its importance cannot be overestimated.

THE PROTECTION OF OUR CONSTITUTION AND OUR FLAG

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week I had to make one of the most difficult decisions of my public service career; whether or not to amend the Constitution of the United States to protect the United States flag. While many Members knew immediately how they would vote, I did not. If I would have only had to make the decision to cast my vote to protect the flag, it would not have been difficult. As one who has served in the Armed Forces, and lived through four wars, I can attest to the principle, honor, and courage, that our flag represents. Under no circumstances would I ever support, or condone, the desecration of the flag that I have personally fought to protect. However, the difficulty stemmed from the method by which we were choosing to protect this extraordinary symbol of our Nation and her people: Amending the Constitution.

As a young boy growing up in the California desert, I learned the meaning and the value of this glorious document. Enshrined in the Constitution of the United States are the rights, privileges, and responsibilities upon which this great Republic rests. Not only as a duly elected representative of my country and my State, but also as a U.S. citizen, I have sworn a solemn oath to uphold this document, carefully crafted by our Founding Fathers almost 200 years ago.

Clearly and unambiguously written in the Constitution is the explicit guarantee that each citizen has the freedom to speak as he or she wishes, without reference to whether others deem their statement popular. The evolving law of the land has also found that our Constitution protects the free expression of thought and opinion as well. It is this first amendment to our Constitution, perhaps the most important, that has created the love we have for our country and made her the envy of the world. I feel strongly, and I would suggest that most everyone in this country does, that there is nothing more crucial to the prosperity and strength of this country than the free, unhindered exchange of ideas.

Last week, I voted to uphold the first amendment by opposing a new constitutional amendment that would have, if enacted, forbid the burning of our national symbol, the American flag. It is my sincere belief that proposed amendments to our Constitution should speak to expanding freedoms, not to limiting the rights, ideas, and aspirations for which the blood of thousands of Americans has been shed. Flag burning is a deeply emotional and disturbing issue, not only for veterans who lost friends and limbs in the defense of this Nation, but for all citizens who look to, and pledge allegiance to our flag, the symbol of

our Republic. Under the flag of this Nation, American men and women marched to turn back the tide of tyranny and repression. As a result of that commitment, billions around the world see the American flag as representative of the highest ideals of humankind.

The questions I had to ask myself were should we tamper with the first amendment because we find revolting and abhorrent the behavior of a few malcontents and juveniles seeking the focus of television cameras and flash bulbs? Should we guarantee each and every display of flag burning its share of media coverage and police action? I was not alone in asking these questions. My own constituency, and I am sure the rest of the country, were wrestling with these same questions and appeared to be virtually split on them. After accessing the views, letters, and phone calls from numerous constituents, I decided we should not. Flag burners, do not threaten our Republic. The Stars-Spangled Banner shall continue to wave regardless of how many radicals will burn it in a fit of anger, unable to get people to pay attention to their views in any other way.

So while our blood may boil, and while we may look upon these displays with anger and sadness, we must remember, that the flag is a symbol of all the rights of this Nation of free individuals enjoy. However, in actuality, it was the Constitution that first created these rights that the flag represents. Isn't ignoring those who burn the flag the best way to silence them, rather than privileging them by weakening the first amendment? We owe at least that much to our veterans as a keeping of faith with the values and ideas for which they fought and for which they made this country the strongest, most enduring and brightest beacon of democracy in the world. In this year when democracy has erupted across the globe, we must not be the first to qualify its meaning.

I voted for the Flag Protection Acts of 1989 and 1990, the statutory method for protecting the flag, in my belief that as our Nation's symbol, the flag should be protected. Much to my disapproval, the Supreme Court found that act to be unconstitutional on a 5-to-4 decision. I do not particularly agree with those five Justices that made that decision, however, I feel I must abide by it. To those of my constituency that I have upset by my decision to vote against the constitutional amendment, I hope they understand my reasoning. I offer my assurances that my love for the flag and its symbolism, is to the highest level. While my decision may not be universally popular, I find the protection of our Constitution to be my highest duty. In the debate surrounding an anti-flag-burning amendment, we have all found one very positive aspect. We all have gained new insight into the importance of the flag to us as individuals and as a nation.

FLAG AMENDMENT

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to insert in the June 21 CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD my statement on the flag amendment vote in the House. However, it was inadvertently left out of that RECORD. I would like to submit my statement at this time in order that my views on this important issue can be made known.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the flag amendment legislation that we consider today in the House.

At about this time last year, the Supreme Court decided that burning the flag was a protected form of free speech. The decision was close—5 to 4—but that was the decision. Now, many of us were frankly astounded by that decision, astounded and gravely disappointed, and I was one of those in this House who immediately afterward introduced legislation to reverse it.

However, I took this step not at all lightly, because I believed that to reverse this decision of the Supreme Court one course and one course only was open to us. That course required amending the U.S. Constitution.

I accept that the Constitution must remain open to amendment, indeed, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind." However, I likewise agree with Mr. Jefferson in not being an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. That is why my decision was such a difficult one.

Others in this Chamber protested, claiming that a law could be written that would at once protect our flag and be acceptable to the Supreme Court without amending the Constitution. I was skeptical, but I chose to try that option in the faint hope that it might be successful. Now we know the result: The Supreme Court struck down that law, too, by the same 5-4 margin.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are here today to initiate the process by which our Constitution may be amended for the 27th time—and I think that is important to keep in mind. We who support this legislation are deciding nothing here today. We are simply opening the door for the people of this Nation to speak. Should this legislation pass the Congress, the question will go to each of the States. They—the people of this Nation—will make a final decision on this matter and I stand ready to accept their verdict.

I never accepted that this was an issue of free speech, that burning the flag is a form of protest. The American flag does not stand for any particular Government policy or decision or person. It stands for the United States of America, and to desecrate it means that America shouldn't exist—that freedom and democracy shouldn't exist—that in fact, the right to peaceful protest shouldn't exist. I cannot and will not support this idea.

The late Senator from Illinois, Everett M. Dirksen, once answered this free speech argument. He called it false and sour.

"A person can revile the flag to his evil heart's content," he said, "But it is only if his contempt takes physical form—such as trampling, tearing, spitting and burning the flag—that he can be punished. Only his violence is punished," he said.

I couldn't argue more. I say that by protecting our flag we deny no one the right of free speech or of peaceful political protest. I'll defend the right of anyone to get up and say whatever is on his mind.

That is, in fact, the entire point: By defending the flag we ensure that this right never will be denied. All we ask is that the flag be accorded the same respect we offer to those who protest under its freedoms.

If living symbols of freedom and liberty mean nothing, if the ideals and not the evidence are all that matter, why don't we just open up the archives and tear up the Constitution and Declaration of Independence? They're just fading, old pieces of paper, aren't they?

The fact of the matter is that they are much more than that. They have told generations and generations of immigrants seeking a better life—immigrants like my parents and some of yours—that here in America we believe it is an individual's right to choose, to control his own destiny.

This flag means America—it means that we should be able to disagree. How can anyone believe otherwise? How could anyone not choose freedom over tyranny, justice over injustice, liberty over servitude? These great ideas are what this flag—our flag—stands for. It is hope, dreams, the very best man can offer the world and the future.

That is the promise that our flag holds out to the oppressed people of the many lands around the globe. It is the same promise that those people have seen in these stars and stripes for generations.

It is that promise of opportunity and fulfillment that has drawn millions to our shores ever since the first star-spangled banner was run up the flagpole.

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me about all of this is that we as a nation must go to these lengths—to the extreme of amending the document upon which all of our national history and heritage rests—to reconfirm these very national beliefs. Yet because of the decisions of the Supreme Court, we must, in fact, do that. We are driven to do so through our reverence for the national banner and our lack of options.

Our freedom, our ability to live life generally as we please within the conventions of society, has not come cheaply. Our cemeteries are filled with the bodies of those who had great dreams of productive lives with loving families—dreams that were forfeited in order that you and I and our children would be able to lead better lives.

Our freedoms have been bought and paid for by that sacrifice, and I believe that we owe it to them to ensure that this country can be all that it was meant to be. In my mind that doesn't include contempt and desecration—it requires determined, constructive effort every day. All of this and more is woven into those few yards of cloth—and that is why I will vote to support this legislation.

COST-OF-LIVING PAY RAISE NEEDED BY FEDERAL EMPLOY- EES IN SANTA BARBARA, CA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which will allow those Federal employees residing in Santa Barbara County, CA to continue serving the Federal Government while residing in a county where the cost of living has risen considerably.

By proposing to increase the salaries of Federal employees in the New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles CSMA's by 8 percent, the administration has taken the first step in rectifying the gross disparities which exist between the salaries of public sector and private sector employees. Although I applaud the administration for putting forward this locality pay initiative and recognizing the need for action in this matter, I am concerned that the proposal excludes many areas, such as Santa Barbara County, which suffer equally from the problems associated with a high cost of living.

The legislation I am introducing today will provide the same pay raise for Federal employees residing in Santa Barbara County as for those Federal employees living in the counties contained in the Los Angeles CSMA, including Ventura County.

Any pay proposal passed should take into account the entire country, acknowledging that pockets of high cost exist throughout. High cost pockets, such as Santa Barbara County, should not be excluded from Federal pay reform merely because they are not located in proximity to a major metropolitan area.

The Federal employees in Santa Barbara County wish to continue serving their country. By granting a pay raise to the Federal employees of Santa Barbara County equal to the proposal for counties within the Los Angeles CSMA, we can provide those employees with the relief they need until a comprehensive Federal pay reform package is formulated and passed into law.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this much needed legislation.

NORTH AMERICAN VAN LINES SHOULD BE REIMBURSED FOR DAMAGES

HON. JILL LONG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse contractors of the Department of the Army for certain damages to property in Panama.

This legislation is very narrow in scope. It would only apply to contractors located on a military installation of the United States in Panama on December 22, 1989, pursuant to requirements of the contract. Furthermore,

only the damages caused by actions of the U.S. Armed Forces during Operation Just Cause would be eligible for reimbursement.

The Secretary of the Army would be authorized to consider a reimbursement if it is presented within 2 years following the date of damages, and only if the damages have not in any way been caused by negligent or wrongful acts of the contractor or the contractor's agents.

Mr. Speaker, I was made aware of the need for this legislation by a company which is headquartered in my congressional district, North American Van Lines. North American owns a Panamanian subsidiary, NAVPAN, which is an authorized United States Government contractor. Approximately 95 percent of the business activity of NAVPAN relates to performing moving services for the Department of Defense, the U.S. Embassy in Panama, and the Panama Canal Commission. As a United States Government contractor, NAVPAN was required to locate its facilities within the perimeter of Albrook Air Force Base, in the Panama Canal Zone. The company has leased an old hangar from the Secretary of the Army since 1963.

This hangar was occupied by armed members of Manuel Noriega's "Dignity Battalion" on December 22, 1989. After unsuccessful efforts to neutralize the enemy with smaller weapons, U.S. forces decided to employ missiles, which destroyed both the hangar and the NAVPAN facilities located within.

North American promptly prepared reimbursement proceedings for the estimated \$615,000 of damages which resulted from this action. Unfortunately, the Department of the Army was compelled to deny North American's request, stating that the legislative authority does not exist to reimburse contractors for damages sustained during combat activity.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I am introducing today is quite straightforward, and it ought to be noncontroversial. It will simply give the Secretary of the Army the authority to reimburse North American for its losses. In this way, the damages arising from Operation Just Cause may be fairly assessed, and compensations may be made accordingly.

It is a great injustice that the United States is sending millions of dollars to Panama to help rebuild the country after Operation Just Cause, while a United States-owned firm which has faithfully served our Government in Panama for 27 years cannot even get reimbursement for damages considered. Moreover, if NAVPAN is forced to rebuild its facilities without reimbursement funds, it will be less likely for the company to continue operations. This will be a great inconvenience for the U.S. Government agencies which have come to rely on NAVPAN for transportation needs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, while \$600,000 may not sound like much on Capitol Hill anymore, it does represent more than one-quarter of the losses suffered by North American Van Lines last year. Recovery of those losses is expected to determine whether the company will be in the red or the black this year. I am thus concerned about the future of a prominent business which has been in Fort Wayne for nearly 40 years, as well as the future of its

3,000 employees who live in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States invaded Panama last December, we as a nation assumed a great responsibility. The legislation which I have proposed will be a small step toward more completely fulfilling that responsibility.

BILINGUALISM IN GOVERNMENT DOES NOT WORK

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, the world is watching as Canada, our good friend to the north, wrestles with a language conflict that threatens to split the fiber of the nation. As we witness the Canadian constitutional crisis, an inescapable conclusion is emerging: Bilingualism in government does not work.

After years of attempting to provide equal status for English and French, Canada is divided by bitterness, resentment, and even hatred. The message for the future of the United States is being played out in present-day Canada.

While language conflicts in our country are serious now, they are not acute. However, as Canadians have learned, linguistic problems often bubble beneath the surface for years before erupting. Discord between French speakers and English speakers dates back 200 years in Canada. The country became officially bilingual in 1969, according equal status to both French and English. However, 5 years later, Quebec adopted French as its official language in an effort to preserve its unique French culture and language. That decision, and subsequent laws to enforce it, created bitterness and resentment in English Canada.

The language issue in Canada differs from that in the United States in some ways. Our country is historically English speaking. For centuries, immigrants coming here have recognized the necessity to learn the common language of the land. Today, however, we are hearing demands for official bilingualism in the United States. These small fissures developing beneath the surface of our national unity may now one day erupt, much as they have in Canada 21 years after that country declared itself officially bilingual.

Canada is living testimony to the divisiveness of official bilingualism and its serious threat to national unity. English and French speakers in Canada are so polarized that, regardless of the outcome, the division will take years to heal. Baseball fans in Toronto have booed the French verses of the national anthem; English speakers have stomped on the Quebec flag in Ontario and Quebec has forbidden stores to post signs in English.

The United States cannot ignore language strife in Canada, nor can it dismiss as unimportant the frequent calls for official bilingualism in this country. Hispanic activists, claiming to speak for Hispanic Americans, are demanding Government services in Spanish. This spring, the Hispanic Issues Conference in

Racine, WI, endorsed a full, bilingual approach to public affairs: Spanish-speaking poll workers at elections; Spanish language news updates in local newspapers; important information printed in both English and Spanish, side by side so that one language would not be higher than another.

Some activists maintain that Hispanics will not assimilate into the culture of the United States. Therefore, Government services must be provided in Spanish. Still others point out that there are now areas of the country where a knowledge of Spanish, and not English, is vital for daily living.

In light of all this, as well as the constitutional question in Canada, it is time to ask whether the ultimate goal of these Hispanic activists is to institute bilingual Government in the United States. Do they seek to establish linguistic enclaves in this country, much like Quebec?

If the answer is yes, we as a nation need to examine exactly what bilingualism in government will mean. For example, what will be the public expense? In Canada, official bilingualism on the Federal level costs one-half billion dollars annually. The Canadian Government in Ottawa employs 1,500 language experts. The expense of providing Federal bilingualism is a source of resentment.

In the United States the costs would be exorbitant. Of the 208 languages in the world, 148 are represented in this country. If we offer Government services in Spanish, are we also going to offer them in French, German, Italian, Farsi, Tagalog, Greek, and all the others?

Should Canadian unity survive its current crisis, there is still a lesson for the United States concerning our own current language debate. With the Canadian turmoil in mind, perhaps we would do well to heed President Teddy Roosevelt who 75 years ago made an excellent argument for one common language of government:

The one absolutely certain way of bringing this Nation to ruin, of preventing all possibility of its continuing to be a Nation at all, would be to permit it to become a Nation of squabbling nationalities.

To ensure that we remain a nation of unity, one in which strength is forged from rich cultural diversity through a common language, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 81, the English language amendment to the Constitution, designating English as the official language of the United States.

**IN MEMORY OF W.O. COOPER,
PAST NATIONAL PRESIDENT
OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN
VETERANS**

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, this country recently lost one of its great civic leaders—a pillar of the civic community of the cities of Austin and Dallas and the State of Texas, and an outstanding spokesman for our disabled veterans—William O'Brien Cooper, known to

those close to him as "Bill." He died recently in Paris, France, at the age of 81.

In recent years, Bill Cooper lived in my district in Austin, TX, and he was just as active and effective a leader as he was in earlier years with the Dallas and Texas Junior Chambers of Commerce, when he served as president of each group. He loved to take part in youth projects, like the establishment of a summer camp for predelinquent boys.

Bill's service to his Nation began, like many young men of his day, immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Bill enlisted in the Tank Corps of the U.S. Army, serving with the 12th Armored Division from 1942 to 1946. His service earned him the Bronze Star, France's Medal of Liberation, and numerous World War II campaign medals.

When the war ended, Bill became interested in the needs and problems of war veterans and their dependants. He provided great assistance to World War II vets through his work with the Federal Government in veterans, housing, and reemployment programs, serving in the Southwestern States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas for 4 years before entering private business.

Through his business career, Bill continued to work on behalf of veterans, especially the disabled. He held positions of leadership at the local, State, and national levels in the Disabled American Veterans, becoming its national commander in 1960. Under his leadership, new emphasis was placed on broadening the range of services available to disabled veterans and their dependants. Through the efforts of Bill's administration, the DAV veterans service grew to be one of the most outstanding programs of its kind in the Nation.

The past national adjutant general of the Disabled American Veterans, Denver D. Adams, credited Bill Cooper not only with the organization's success but its very survival. "Bill was one of the generals that led the DAV out of the throws of bankruptcy" when the DAV was on the brink of financial ruin, Adams said. Upon learning of Bill's death, past national commander Billy Kirby described Bill as "a man who was everything the DAV stands for, a true gentleman. He never once sought to get anything out of the DAV. He only sought to give what he could give, how he could best serve his fellow man."

Following his tenure as national commander of the DAV, Bill was chosen by the U.S. Department of State to become the Director of the Agency for International Development to the Sudan, a position he held until 1967. For his efforts with the Agency, Bill was honored by the Sudanese on numerous occasions for his personal contributions to the economic development of the country.

Bill continued his lifelong work on behalf of veterans and earned worldwide recognition while serving as Secretary General of the World Veterans Federation from 1967 to 1976. The Federation includes associations of war veterans, former resistance fighters, deportees, prisoners of war, and war victims from 49 countries on 5 continents. Under Bill's leadership, the Federation worked to promote the interests of all people disabled by war.

For his important contributions as WVF Secretary General, Bill was inducted into the Order of Orange-Nassau, one of the highest

honors the country of the Netherlands can bestow. During Bill's induction into the Order, the Dutch Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs described Bill as "a man who not only advocated but translated into his daily life the principles of freedom, peace, and human dignity."

Mr. Speaker, from a personal standpoint, I have lost a dear and loyal friend. Bill Cooper and I were not only good friends when it came to veterans matters, we were close personal friends.

For the last 15 years or so, Bill lived in Austin and was active in civic and political affairs. He never let up on his activities, carrying on with the vigor of a much younger man and remaining extraordinarily loyal to his friends and his causes. Somehow you knew that Bill Cooper would always be there to do something for you or for a good cause—not just waiting to be asked, but taking the initiative ahead of time.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Cooper's death is an inestimable loss to veterans in this country and around the world. I have visited his family: his wife Lucille of Austin, TX, his son, Don, and daughter-in-law, Eva, of Alexandria, VA, and two grandchildren, Paul and Stephanie. I feel a very personal loss with the passing of this remarkable, warm and kind man.

**BUSH ADMINISTRATION RE-
FUSES TO ENFORCE ANTI-
APARTHEID SANCTIONS**

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Bush welcomed to the White House, Nelson Mandela, Deputy President of the African National Congress. Today, Mr. Mandela addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress.

Yet it is ironic that—almost 4 years after the enactment over President Reagan's veto of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986—the Bush administration, like the Reagan administration before it, continues to refuse to enforce the sanctions required by law against the racist apartheid Government of South Africa.

A year ago, I became aware of the fact—in spite of explicit language in the Anti-Apartheid Act that "no iron or steel produced, or iron ore extracted, in South Africa may be imported into the United States"—that the Reagan and Bush administrations had consciously permitted 1.8 billion pounds of iron and steel products to enter the United States from South Africa in just the first 2 full years of the law.

Not just the failure, but the conscious refusal of the Reagan and Bush administrations to enforce the sanctions with regard to iron and steel contained in the Anti-Apartheid Act was exposed in an excellent series of articles by Kenneth F. Bunting of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Some of the South African steel that the Bush administration says is not covered by Congress' absolute ban—you see the Presi-

dent and his agents say that Congress did not mean what it said in the law—is destined for a bridge over the Houston Ship Channel at Baytown, TX.

The third largest suspension bridge in America and the largest single project ever undertaken by the Texas Department of Highways and Public Transportation will, if the use of the 11 million pounds of South African steel approved for import by the Bush administration is permitted, be a monument to racism.

Many of us in the Congress cosponsored the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 and enacted it over President Reagan's veto to send a clear and unquestionable message to the Government of South Africa that the American people do not approve of, will not condone, and will no longer economically support the racist apartheid system which oppresses 26 million South African blacks like Nelson Mandela.

The Bush administration's failure to enforce the letter of the law muddles that message and minimizes its impact at a time when United States policy should be—as Nelson Mandela told the Congress and the American people today—to increase economic and political pressure on South Africa, rather than relax it. The nonracial democratic government demanded by the Anti-Apartheid Act—and nothing short of that—must continue to be our requirement for easing the sanctions.

Sadly, the Reagan and Bush administrations found every conceivable loophole in the Anti-Apartheid Act to avoid enforcing fully the sanctions against South Africa.

Where there were no loopholes—as in the case of the absolute ban on all iron, steel, and iron ore products from South Africa—the Reagan and Bush administrations invented loopholes so big you could bring in enough steel from South Africa to build more than 100 Astrodomes.

Although Kenneth F. Bunting of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram deserves credit for breaking this important story of the Bush administration's failure to enforce the South African steel sanctions, Dan Stets of the Philadelphia Inquirer has done perhaps the most definitive reporting on the Bush administration's refusal to put teeth in the sanctions designed to help end apartheid in South Africa.

As we can still hear the powerful words of Nelson Mandela, I call to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the impressive account reported by Dan Stets: Doing Business With South Africa: Loopholes Hobble U.S. Sanctions.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 13, 1990]

DOING BUSINESS WITH S. AFRICA: LOOPHOLES HOBBLE U.S. SANCTIONS

(By Dan Stets)

On an October day almost four years ago the senator from Indiana rose in the middle of a torrid Capitol Hill debate to address his colleagues.

"We are dealing with a tragic situation," said Republican Richard G. Lugar. "People are being killed. . . . We are against tyranny, and tyranny is in South Africa."

Riding the tide of that sentiment, the Senate voted, 78-21, to override President Ronald Reagan's veto of legislation imposing economic sanctions.

Congress meant the sanctions to demonstrate that there would be no more business as usual with the ruling white "tyranny" in South Africa.

Nearly four years later, they have demonstrated a lot less than that.

Congress thought it was stopping the flow of U.S. oil to South Africa.

Almost 19 million gallons of U.S. petroleum products have arrived in Durban since 1986.

Congress thought it was putting an end to the U.S. import of South Africa steel.

Eleven million pounds of South African steel is being used to build a bridge near Houston.

Congress thought it was stopping textile imports.

More than 182,000 tons of textile products have arrived from South Africa since 1986.

Congress thought it was banning the shipment of U.S. guns and ammunition to South Africa.

Since then U.S. manufacturers have shipped 53 tons of arms and ammunition to Cape Town—bound, they say, for Zimbabwe.

Congress thought it was banning the import of food from South Africa.

Americans have eaten 1,187 tons of lobster tails and enough tuna to fill 113 million cans, all shipped from South Africa since 1986.

The sanctions passed by Congress have scarcely put a dent in the volume of trade between the United States and South Africa.

In 1985, U.S. companies did \$3.28 billion in business with South Africa. In 1989 they did \$3.19 billion. The United States is South Africa's third-largest trading partner.

Why did the sanctions turn out to be a paper tiger?

First, the law was compromised from the start by the vague language in which it was cast. And second, neither the Reagan nor the Bush administration aggressively enforced it.

In almost four years, only three violations have been successfully prosecuted.

"The Reagan-Bush administration has never been truly supportive of sanctions against South Africa," said Rep. John Bryant (D., Texas). "What they have done is attempt to avoid enforcing them by writing regulations which are far outside the permissible scope of the law."

Both advocates and adversaries of the sanctions law agree that its impact has been far less than many in Congress anticipated.

"The House bill that I introduced was taken by the Senate and watered down," said Rep. William H. Gray 3d. "Certain loopholes and general statements were made which left a lot of room for interpretation."

The Philadelphia Democrat said he believed the loopholes had been exploited by successive Republican administrations not enamored of the law.

"Over the last four years, it is very clear that the Republican administrations . . . tried every possible way to get around the law," Gray said.

Perhaps, said John A. Davies, South African consul in New York, some members of Congress expected too much of their law.

"If you can't topple the government of Cuba in [more than] 20 years, how do you expect your sanctions on South Africa to have any effect, beyond the side effect of putting people out of work?" Davies said.

TUNA

The sanctions law says:

"No article that is suitable for human consumption, that is a product of South Africa may be imported into . . . the United States."

A tuna has no home but the sea.

Just ask the U.S. Customs Service.

Because of that Customs Service ruling, enough tuna has been shipped to the United States from South Africa to fill 113 millions 6½-ounce cans.

Customs decided that the tuna is not really South African because it comes from international waters off South Africa.

The first land the tuna sees is South African, but that does not matter. The tuna is shipped from South Africa, but that does not make it a "product of South Africa" according to a Customs Service ruling.

A key to the ruling: The tuna is caught by Taiwanese fishermen.

This is how the ruling came about.

Star-Kist Foods realized that the anti-apartheid sanctions threatened a vital source of its tuna. The giant tuna company feared that the law could be read to prohibit the import of tuna from Cape Town.

"That act was a lot of concern to us," said Malcolm E. Stockwell, general manager of purchasing for Star-Kist, which is a division of H.J. Heinz Co. of Pittsburgh.

Star-Kist hired James P. Walsh, a Washington lawyer who used to be general counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee.

Walsh received a reply from Gerald J. McManus, acting assistant customs commissioner, which noted a shortcoming that would prove a major stumbling block in the enforcement of the anti-apartheid act. Nowhere did the law define "product of South Africa."

Without that congressional guidance, McManus was left to define it on his own, in accordance with other laws administered by his agency. He decided that under those laws the tuna would not be defined as a South African product.

Star-Kist was allowed to keep importing the tuna because it was caught by Taiwanese—not South African—fishermen.

"There is always an issue about what is a product in fisheries," Walsh said in a recent interview. "What happens frequently is that fish is transshipped around the world, but it basically remains the product of the catching nation. Frequently, Customs get confused about whose product it is."

Before passage of the law, Star-Kist used to buy fish from South African fishermen, Stockwell said.

"Since the law was passed, we have not touched their fish," he said.

Now, he said, Star-Kist only buys fish caught by Taiwanese vessels fishing far out at sea.

How does U.S. Customs know that Star-Kist does not import tuna caught in South African waters or by South African fishermen?

It takes the company's word for it.

That is the answer time and again when it comes to enforcement of the sanctions. The Customs Service does not have enough people to adequately enforce the law, according to a recent study by the General Accounting Office, Congress' investigative arm.

Star-Kist's tuna is frozen and placed in cold storage in Cape Town. The storage areas are bonded warehouses, so, technically speaking, the fish does not enter the customs territory of South Africa.

Then it is shipped aboard a Japanese vessel to Puerto Rico, where the slabs of fish are transformed into the hockey pucks

of tuna that fill familiar cans on grocery shelves across America.

Since passage of the sanctions law, Star-Kist has imported 45 million pounds of tuna from South Africa. That is enough tuna to fill about 44 million cans.

Once Star-Kist got the approval, Bumble Bee Seafoods of San Diego felt free to continue importing tuna through South Africa.

Bill Woods, who supervises procurement for the tuna company, said Bumble Bee also bought exclusively from Taiwanese fishermen who operate off African shores.

"The only port in the area that has cold-storage capacity to consolidate the loads is Cape Town," Woods said. "That's where the vessels discharge their catches. It is then picked up by refrigerated vessels for transportation to Puerto Rico."

Since 1986, those ships have collected 70 million pounds of Bumble Bee tuna from the South African port. That's enough tuna to fill about 69 million cans.

In fact, since Congress passed the sanctions bill, records kept by Piers, a shipping data base owned by the Journal of Commerce in New York, indicate that the amount of tuna arriving in the United States from South Africa has increased dramatically.

Altogether, 116,352 tons of seafood were imported from South Africa to the United States between 1987 and 1989.

But the tuna did not really come from South Africa, the Commerce Department says: It came from the sea.

LOBSTER TAILS

The lobster tails have South Africa written all over them.

No Taiwanese fishermen are involved. No one claims they come from international waters.

They are caught in South African waters by South Africans.

The ruling that exempted tuna from the sanctions law does not apply.

But 1,187 tons of South African lobster tail have been shipped to the United States since Congress passed the anti-apartheid law.

Illegally?

No. Another Customs Service ruling makes legal the import of South African lobster tails.

It is a question not of nationalities or international waters or where the lobsters land. It is, the Customs Service ruled, a question of flags.

Though the lobsters are caught by South Africans operating in South African waters, they are processed on board ships that fly foreign flags—primarily those of Panama and the Cayman Islands, a British colony.

That means that after a lifetime as a South African lobster, the crustacean changes citizenship when it breaks the water's surface.

To justify the ruling, Customs officials went back 20 years to a 1966 case involving fish caught off the coast of Africa by Greek fishermen.

Some of the fish was processed ashore. Some of it was processed aboard Greek ships. Was the fish Greek or African?

Customs ruled that the "country of origin" was the country whose flag flew on the processing vessel.

That same ruling was applied four years ago when Robert L. Follick, a New York lawyer who specializes in customs law, asked whether the sanctions law banned the import of South African lobster tails.

"The ruling merely restated a position that customs had been administratively fol-

lowing for some 20-odd years," Follick said. "There is nothing novel in this result."

Specialty Seafoods of New York is one of the companies that imports frozen fish and lobster tails from South Africa.

"It is foreign product that is landed in South Africa in bond, then imported," said Al Stella of Specialty Seafoods. "It has been common in for many years."

In 1986, the White House got a "wake-up call" on the matter of apartheid.

"We have an opportunity to provide a moral wake-up call for our President, who doesn't understand the issues," said Rep. Gray, the Philadelphia Democrat.

That wake-up call was a resounding vote in both houses to override Ronald Reagan's veto of the sanctions law.

It was a wake-up call that foes of apartheid might have delivered to several presidents since 1960, when the massacre of 69 blacks in Sharpeville by South African police opened the world's eyes to the problem of apartheid.

By 1960, the rigid system under which six million whites now rule over 24 million blacks was 12 years old.

Under apartheid, the white minority controls most of the land and the economy. Blacks are denied a right in national elections that Americans take for granted—one man, one vote.

The United Nations reacted to Sharpeville with a resolution demanding an end to apartheid. The United States took no such action.

Two years after Sharpeville, the United States criticized the use of sanctions and challenged their effectiveness.

Ten months later, Adlai E. Stevenson, then ambassador to the United Nations, denounced a proposed arms embargo against South Africa.

"The application of sanctions in this situation is not likely to bring about the practical result we seek," Stevenson said.

When other nations fought for sanctions, the United States defended South Africa. It vetoed U.N. Security Council attempts at a mandatory trade embargo in the 1970s and at a mandatory oil embargo in the 1980s.

And when Congress, outraged over decades of White House inaction on the plight of black South Africans, passed the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act 1986, it in was swiftly vetoed by Reagan.

Congress reacted with equal swiftness to override him.

"Whether sanctions work or not is not the issue at all," Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D., S.C.) said as the Senate completed the override. "It's about your values as a people—and that's one you don't hesitate on."

Values aside, have the sanctions worked? In this watershed year that has seen the release of Nelson Mandela, John Davies of the South African consul's office says no.

"People say that things are changing in South Africa because of sanctions," Davies said. "That is completely untrue."

"The process of change, the process of political reform, began long before the sanctions were imposed," he said. "In the years subsequent to the act, apart from the past six months, there were practically no reforms."

And, while the new law was the toughest measure ever enacted by the United States against South Africa, it still was pretty limited.

"The thing to remember about the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act is that it is by no means comprehensive," Davies said. "It excludes the majority of trade between South Africa and the U.S."

"Most of the [pre-1986] trade was minerals, most of which are not included—gold, diamonds, vanadium, platinum. Those things between them form the bulk of the trade anyway," he said.

Davies was wrong about gold. It is sold by a government agency, and the law bans all trade with South African agencies.

But he was right about the other minerals, particularly those that the United States decided it had to have for defense reasons.

As to the other trade, Davies said, "by and large, we have managed to find alternative markets."

The Japanese and West Germans moved quickly to take advantage of the business opportunity, emerging as South Africa's leading trade partners.

"Nobody would deny that sanctions, in the global sense, have had an impact on the economy simply because of the fact that they undermined confidence in South Africa," Davies said. "That has led to the inability of South Africa to raise capital abroad."

The sanctions law prohibits new investment by U.S. companies in South Africa, and another congressional action has had more far-reaching impact. In 1988, Congress eliminated U.S. tax credits for taxes paid in South Africa.

That action and continuing public pressure from within the United States had led more than 170 U.S. companies to withdraw from South Africa since 1985. The value of the rand, South Africa's currency, has fallen by more than half since 1986.

"The inability of the country to raise new investment abroad had the serious consequence of preventing the economy from expanding," Davies said. "Apart from that, the sanctions have very little impact."

TEXTILES

The law says:

"No . . . textiles . . . that [are] produced or manufactured in South Africa may be imported into the United States."

Men's wear. Infant wear. Women's wear.

Fabrics.

Cotton.

The textiles continue to come.

A total of 182,789 tons have arrived from South Africa since 1986, according to a review of Piers' shipping records.

House of Nations in New York City received 10 tons of boys' jeans from South Africa in January of last year when the freighter Hazelbank arrived from Durban.

A call to the company in New York shed little light on whether House of Nations knew there was a prohibition against importing textiles from South Africa or whether the goods originated in South Africa.

"I don't know who you are, and I am not giving out any information. It's that simple," said the man who answered the phone at House of Nations. He declined to give his name.

The owner of another New York City clothing firm—Darby Classics—said he took great pains to obey the sanctions law.

Peter Oswald said he traveled to Swaziland, a landlocked country bordered on three sides by South Africa, to be certain that his order for flannel shirts was being filled there.

The 68 tons of shirts would be shipped from Durban, but he wanted to be sure that they weren't manufactured in South Africa as well.

The recurring question—when is a product from South Africa not South African—is particularly troubling to businesses that want to deal with other countries in the region, according to a senior Treasury Department official.

The official, who agreed to be interviewed only on the condition that his name not be used, said there were cases when produce and textiles simply passed through South Africa from adjoining landlocked countries.

Why does the Customs Service label them as South African imports?

A mistake, the official said.

"What Customs has found in most of these cases is that the country of origin is incorrectly shown," he said.

But a Customs Service spokesman said it was very difficult for his agency to catch people determined to circumvent the sanctions law.

"You are talking about millions of shipments a year coming from all over the world," said Edward Kittredge. "I would suppose it is not hard to hide something. We have to depend on people dealing honestly."

How does the Customs Service enforce sanctions-law restrictions?

A General Accounting Office report concluded, "... its enforcement primarily consists of ensuring that documentation on all imports from South Africa contain ... required [approval]."

In other words, the Customs Service simply reviews the paperwork submitted by companies whose business involves South Africa.

The Commerce Department says it is pursuing possible violators.

"There are several investigations going on about illegal export of petroleum products to South Africa," said Bill Arvin, a supervisor with the department's Office of Export Enforcement.

Have the Reagan and Bush administrations turned a blind eye toward the exports?

"It is not so much being allowed as it is just not being caught," Arvin said.

Actually, there have been three.

Two people have pleaded guilty and a third awaits trial for attempting to ship 38 anti-tank-missile guidance components to South Africa.

A Connecticut couple received three years' probation, and their two South African partners got six months in jail for plotting to smuggle 8,000 South African pistols into the United States.

The only American to receive a jail term was a New York man who imported four jet engines from South Africa. He was sentenced to three months in jail and a \$100,000 fine. His company was fined \$1 million. The engines were worth \$5 million to \$6 million.

CONSUMER PRODUCTS

Try the Pizza Hut or Kentucky Fried Chicken. Fill up with Mobil. Have a Coke, a bowl of Kellogg's Corn Flakes, a dab of Heinz catsup. Shoot a roll of Kodak film. Pick up some Eveready batteries and a bottle of Johnson & Johnson baby oil. Drive a Ford.

Sounds like America?

It's South Africa today.

The U.S. sanctions, targeted at such specific products as oil, steel and food, were not designed to cripple the day-to-day consumer economy of South Africa. And they haven't.

Scores of products that seem to define the American marketplace are available in South Africa.

Sanctions may have helped kill off foreign investment and driven down the value of South African currency, but they have done little to change the shopping habits of South Africans.

Businesses have found countless ways to satisfy the letter of the sanctions law without depriving South African consumers of products many hold dear. And when the market-place has felt the influence of anti-apartheid pressures, more often than not an American company has voluntarily changed its way of doing business.

Often the brand name has been changed or the price is higher.

Kodak, for example, no longer ships its film to South Africa. But the film remains widely available. Wholesalers simply buy the film from suppliers in the Middle East and Australia, passing it on to South Africans at higher prices.

Many shops carry Heinz catsup. But it is made by the H.J. Heinz Co. of Canada, a subsidiary of the Pittsburgh firm, and imported by South African merchants.

Other products retain their American brand names, but are manufactured in South Africa under licensing arrangements.

In some cases, American companies have divested by selling their assets to South African buyers, who continue to market the same products.

General Motors, for instance, sold its assets to South African investors, who formed Delta Motors. Delta manufactures the very same cars that GM once made, using components brought from GM.

IBM sold its local assets to a South African company. The local firm imports and sells IBM computers. The Ford Motor Co. sold its assets to the South African Motor Corp., which still manufactures the "Ford Sierra," a model Ford makes and sells in Europe.

Coca-Cola moved its syrup plant to neighboring Swaziland, selling its South African assets to locals. They formed the National Beverage Services Co. to license bottlers who keep South Africa supplied with Coke.

Tune in to *Dallas*, *thirtysomething*, *Designing Women*, *Wonder Years* and *Murphy Brown*.

No problem in South Africa.

State-run television runs current episodes of those and other popular American TV shows.

Johannesburg has a video rental shop on virtually every corner, and the counters are piled high with recent American films.

Movies—*Born on the Fourth of July* and *Driving Miss Daisy*—arrived in South Africa within months of their debuts in New York.

Almost four years after Congress imposed sanctions, South Africans have struggled with the political and psychological impact, but in the marketplace they have barely paid the price.

IRON AND STEEL

The law says:

"... no iron or steel produced in South Africa may be imported into the United States."

The third-longest suspension bridge in America will arch into the sky just west of Houston. Only the Verrazano Narrows and Golden Gate bridges are longer than the 4,100-foot steel span that soon will carry traffic over the Houston Ship Channel.

On South African steel.

Eleven million pounds of it.

It slipped through a Reagan administration loophole—a ruling by the Customs Service that the sanctions law did not address unassembled bridge sections.

The ruling that created the loophole produced screams of outrage from Rep. Bryant, a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which has oversight responsibility for the Customs Service.

It is a big loophole.

Steel and iron can be fashioned into thousands of products. The Customs Service ruled that the sanctions law only covered 15 types of them, Bryant said.

About 900,000 tons of South African iron and steel—worth more than \$350 million—flowed into the United States in 1987 and 1988, Bryant said.

He wrote to Treasury Secretary Nicholas F. Brady to complain, pointing out that nearly half of the imports were pig iron, which clearly was banned under Treasury Department regulations.

"The Treasury Department's failure to enforce the letter of the law muddles the message and minimizes its impact at a time when U.S. policy should be to increase economic and political pressure on South Africa, rather than relax it," he wrote Brady.

The Bush administration defended its ruling at a congressional hearing in February.

Herman J. Cohen, assistant secretary of state for African affairs, said iron and steel were being allowed into the country because of the "legislative history" of the act.

Cohen said that history—including the debate on the floor of the Senate—suggested that Congress envisioned a ban mirroring that of the European Economic Community.

The EEC does not ban all iron and steel products.

If it was not banned in Europe, the Reagan administration ruled, Congress did not intend to ban it here.

Enter the prefabricated steel for the Houston channel bridge.

Bryant said the administration's position was outrageous.

"The law absolutely bans all iron and steel from South Africa after Dec. 31, 1986," he said. "No exceptions are permitted."

OIL AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

The law says:

"No crude oil or refined petroleum product ... may be exported to South Africa."

South Africa has half the world's gold.

South Africa has 12 percent of the world's diamonds.

But it has none of the world's oil.

Turning off the spigot that poured oil into South Africa seemed like the quickest way to undermine its Westernized economy and get the attention of its white leaders.

The Arab oil producers thought so when they announced an embargo in 1973; the United Nations thought so when it approved an embargo in 1979, and the U.S. Congress thought so when it voted sanctions into law.

South Africa still has plenty of oil.

Tankers heavy with crude oil sail into Durban almost daily; delivering as much as 3.9 billion gallons of oil a year.

The South African government refuses to discuss oil imports, but a study by an independent shipping research group based in the Netherlands has determined that most of it comes from Arab countries that ignore the various embargoes.

A study of Piers' shipping records since the sanctions were imposed shows that U.S. companies have stopped open shipments of crude oil to South Africa.

But petroleum-based products are another matter.

U.S. companies have shipped almost 19 million gallons of petroleum-based products to South Africa since 1986.

And most of those shipments have the explicit blessing of the U.S. government.

The products largely are lubricant additives, vital to the machinery of industry and transportation.

Congressional sponsors say they intended a broad ban on such exports, but the Commerce Department has determined that the sanctions law applies to just 49 of the hundreds of variations of petroleum products.

It is difficult to put a precise value of the U.S. petroleum-based products that have gone to South Africa since 1986, but industry analysts estimate they have been worth more than \$190 million and perhaps as much as \$760 million.

Made in large part from crude oil, the additives give lubricating oil the ability to prevent automobile motors and industrial machinery from overheating.

"Without the additives, your car's engine would burn. The oil would just burn up," said John P. Bye, an industry analyst from Provident National Bank in Philadelphia. "It is an engineered product that is vital."

In other words, the additives keep the engines of South Africa running smoothly, the very engines that Congress had hoped to silence when it passed the sanctions law.

The red, white and blue flag of Liberia fluttered from the stern of the tanker that steamed into the South African port of Durban one September afternoon last year.

There was nothing Liberian about its cargo.

The tanker Stolt Excellence carried more than 300,000 gallons of oil additives manufactured by two American companies. It had taken on the \$3 million cargo in Houston three weeks earlier.

In Durban, the additives would be blended with other petroleum products to make lubricating oil.

A petroleum-based product manufactured by a U.S. company and dispatched to South Africa from a U.S. port.

A violation of the sanctions law?

"We are fully in tune with the United States government on this business of South Africa," said Joseph I. Rue, company secretary at Lubrizol Corp. of Wickliffe, Ohio.

The second company that had cargo aboard the Stolt Excellence agreed.

"These are not petroleum products as is commonly accepted. These are additives," said Paul Murphy, a spokesman for Caltex Petroleum Corp., a joint venture of two major U.S. oil companies, Chevron Corp. and Texaco Inc.

"You are talking about petroleum being an ingredient in the product," he said in a telephone interview. "The phone I am using is a petroleum-based product in a sense."

That's the critical question: What is a petroleum product under the sanctions law?

Both company records and a top executive of Lubrizol indicated that the additives it shipped to South Africa were manufactured primarily from crude oil.

John Bye, the industry analyst, said the additive "is not a direct oil product, but it is made from chemicals which are made from oil."

Caltex and Lubrizol did not ship the material without making sure they had the permission of the U.S. government.

"According to the Commerce Department's own definition of petroleum prod-

ucts, and in light of advice we received from product engineers and inside and outside counsel, we concluded these were clearly not petroleum products," Murphy said.

Murphy is right. Under Commerce Department regulations, the shipments to South Africa are legal.

Are those Commerce Department regulations a reflection of what Congress had in mind when it passed the sanctions law?

"If it is a lubricating additive and it is based on petroleum, then the intent of the law is that it would be covered," said Robert Brauer, special counsel to Rep. Ronald V. Dellums, (D., Calif.), one of the chief sponsors of the Anti-Apartheid Act.

The 300,000 gallons of oil additives that the Stolt Excellence delivered to Durban for Lubrizol and Caltex in September reflected the extensive business the two U.S. companies do with South Africa.

Shipping records indicate that Lubrizol has been the prime U.S. exporter of petroleum products to South Africa since 1986, sending dozens of shipments of additives each year.

Since the sanctions went into effect, Lubrizol has shipped 12.5 million gallons of petroleum-derived products worth at least \$125 million to South Africa.

Caltex, the second-largest U.S. exporter of petroleum products to South Africa, has shipped 3.3 million gallons worth at least \$33 million to South Africa since 1986.

But another big company said the law changed its way of doing business.

"We stopped because of the passage of the law," said John C. Lord, a spokesman for Mobil Corp.

Lord said Mobil believed that the law clearly prohibited the export to South Africa of specialty oil products, including lubricating oils and additives.

Its exports to South Africa dwindled to almost nothing after passage of the law.

FOODS

The law says:

"No agricultural commodity, product, by-product [or] . . . article that is suitable for human consumption, that is a product of South Africa may be imported into the . . . United States. . . ."

The food from South Africa keeps coming. Coffee, tea, fruits, tobacco, alcoholic and nonalcoholic beverages.

More than 40,000 tons of food and tobacco have been imported from South Africa since 1986, according to shipping records.

Those imports were valued at \$4.3 million in 1988 alone, according to statistics compiled by the Commerce Department.

The food imports—which have dropped considerably since 1986—are something few people want to talk about or own up to.

Those who will talk generally say that the food simply passed through South Africa on its way from another African country to the United States.

Still, there are some puzzling cases.

Take the canned pineapple concentrate shipped from South Africa to Y.S. International of Miami.

Pineapples are grown in several African countries. South Africa is the continent's leading producer and ranks eighth in the world.

Shipping manifests show that Y.S. International received 20 tons of pineapple concentrate—588 containers full—on Nov. 11, 1987. The pineapple came from Durban to Savannah, GA, aboard a Panamanian ship, the Gacka.

"I don't think I have ever handled a shipment from South Africa," said John

Southby, owner of Y.S. International in a telephone interview.

Southby, who said he knew nothing about a pineapple shipment, described his firm as a forwarding company that serves various importers.

"Basically, we don't import anything," he said.

Then there's a company called Rohde & Liesenfeld of New York City.

The company received a shipment of 260 tons of tobacco that arrived in Baltimore aboard a freighter, the Virgo, on Oct. 17, 1987. The tobacco came from Durban, according to shipping records.

Although his company imports tobacco, import agent Steve Rofaf said he did not believe Rohde & Liesenfeld ever imported tobacco from South Africa. And if it did, he said, it certainly did not own the tobacco.

"We are just a broker and freight forwarder," Rofaf said. "The merchandise would not have been ours."

Then there is coffee.

General Foods received a shipment of 2.5 million pounds of coffee from South Africa.

General Foods sells coffee under the brand names Maxwell House, Yuban, Sanka and Brim.

The coffee did come from South Africa, according to General Foods spokesman Cliff Sessions. But, he said, it was grown in Uganda.

"It left Uganda on a ship named the Merchant Principal on Sept. 26 [1989]," Sessions said. "It went to Durban, South Africa. For some reasons, the coffee was transferred to the Columbine at Durban and left there Sept. 25."

Again, the Commerce Department accepted the paperwork as sufficient evidence that the shipment was not a "product of South Africa."

ARMS

The law says:

"No item contained on the United States Munition List . . . may be exported to South Africa . . . for use by the armed forces, police, or other security forces of South Africa or for other military use."

The guns are not really going to South Africa. Like the tuna and the lobster and the clothing and the coffee, they are just passing through, according to the U.S. companies that ship them there.

About 53 tons of U.S. small arms and ammunition were shipped to South Africa between 1987 and 1989, according to shipping records.

The guns were bound for Zimbabwe, South Africa's landlocked neighbor, the gun manufacturers said.

"Indeed, the shipment was made," said John R. Falk, of Olin Corp. in Stamford, Conn. "However, South Africa was strictly an intermediate stop. It was consigned to Zimbabwe. It was one of several shipments to Zimbabwe."

The shipping records show that Olin sent pistol and rifle ammunition from its Winchester division in Illinois to Cape Town last year.

To prove that his company had not violated the law, Falk produced a copy of Olin's export declaration, which showed that the company had shipped 9,000 pounds of ammunition to Harare, Zimbabwe, through an intermediary in Cape Town.

Shipping records indicate that Jonas Aircraft & Arms of New York City sent 1,588 pounds of ammunition, four cases of pistols and several crates of rifles to a consignee in Cape Town in 1989.

"We don't export anything to South Africa," said Jeff Steinemann, a salesman for the company. "We sell to Zimbabwe, and its gets passed through South Africa. We would never get an export license to South Africa. That is an impossibility."

All of the shipments to Zimbabwe, formerly known as Rhodesia, are approved by the State Department, he said.

"We are a company that has been in business over 50 years, and we intend to stay in business as long as we can," Steineman said. "There is no reason to do anything that is not legal or appropriate."

Steineman declined to produce export documents that indicated the weaponry had gone to Zimbabwe.

The documents he provided the Commerce Department were sufficient to satisfy the agency.

Once again, the government relied solely on paperwork submitted by the exporter as proof that the shipments went on to Zimbabwe and did not violate the sanctions law. Both companies—Olin and Jonas—were judged by the Commerce Department to be well within the law.

Nelson Mandela has been freed and the wheels of change are clearly turning in South Africa.

Do sanctions matter any more?

Yes, says Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who says they must continue until there are signs of "irreversible change."

Yes, says Mandela, who is calling for stiff U.S. sanctions to speed the reforms.

Yes, says Rep. Gray, who recently met with South Africa President F.W. de Klerk in Pretoria.

"I think it is very clear that . . . Reagan and Bush have allowed an interpretation of the Anti-Apartheid Act which gets around the spirit if not the letter of the law and provides economic fuel for the political engine of apartheid," Gray said.

"That must stop," he said.

He predicted that if the South Africa government did not move to abolish apartheid quickly, Congress would put real teeth in the sanctions law.

Gray, who recently led a congressional delegation to South Africa, said de Klerk had told him that he favored majority rule and was willing to negotiate with black leaders to achieve it.

"If there is no substantive negotiations [toward majority rule]," Gray said. "I think you may see Congress in this session seek to close all of the loopholes in [the law]."

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE MARKS 80 YEARS OF PROGRESS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of its 80th anniversary, I would like to pay tribute to the National Urban League.

The National Urban League is a proud and strong coalition of Americans committed to racial equality. For eight decades, it has been committed to equal opportunity and the creation of an open, integrated, and pluralistic society. The league has met many challenges and has led the way with its multiracial and nonpartisan approach.

Born of hope and necessity in 1910, the Committee on Urban Conditions Among Ne-

groes dared to promote interracial cooperation at a time when racism was rampant in America. Since then the National Urban League has been providing education and jobs to minorities across the country. Its history begins with the great migration northward of millions of African Americans leaving the South early in the century. It spans the race riots, World War I, and the building of jobs and families during the twenties. During the Great Depression the National Urban League helped African Americans fight for survival. During World War II, it created national programs to ease racial tension and increase production in the defense industries. After the war, efforts were focused on jobs, training, and housing.

A period of bridge-building followed. The National Urban League built links to businesses, foundations, governments—the power structure of America—to finance programs in education and employment for the disadvantaged. During the turmoil and tragedy of the sixties and seventies, the National Urban League was there as a healer and a helper.

Its presidents became national leaders with their message of hope. Their names are familiar to millions of Americans—George Edmund Haynes, Eugene Kinckle Jones, Lester B. Granger, Whitney M. Young, Jr., Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., and John E. Jacob. These leaders provided hope and inspiration, as well as jobs and education to millions of African Americans.

The National Urban League now has affiliates in 114 cities, representing 34 States and the District of Columbia. With the national headquarters staff and affiliates, the Urban League has more than 2,500 staff members, and over 30,000 volunteers. The league provides programs of direct service to a million people each year. Its name has always been synonymous with employment, training, and job placement. The league also undertakes advocacy, research, and special projects which have a positive impact on the lives of additional millions. Last year it worked in the educational interest of over 2.5 million African-American public school students. Every year it raises more than \$50 million in support of skills training, career counseling, and job placement.

John E. Jacob, the league's current president and chief executive officer, is a leader who looks to the future as well as remembers the past. Mr. Jacob has developed an alliance with business and government to help negotiate power from the powerful and give it to the powerless. He has called for a new Urban Marshall Plan to investigate our cities and our people. He has called for black/white parity by the year 2000.

I say it is a dream worthy of a great leader and a great organization. This dream could come true if the White House and Congress were to implement the necessary steps. The ending of the Cold War gives the opportunity to bring this dream to reality. During the coming decade, over a third of the new entrants in the labor force will be composed of minorities. Mr. Jacob has stated, that "This offers an opportunity to integrate the disadvantaged into the economic mainstream. To ignore this opportunity could prove devastating to America, producing a country where

people need jobs and jobs need people—without a match between the two."

The National Urban League also plays a leading role with its publication, "The State of Black America", the most authoritative annual document examining the conditions of African Americans. The book addresses the disparities in American society and gives insights into the solutions for achieving justice and equality. It is used by members of Congress and the other influential leaders. And while "The State of Black America" may not be sufficient to change the course of national events, each year it reaches out to the conscience of the country.

The National Urban League annual conference includes provocative addresses by American leaders and scholars. It is called the Nation's foremost forum on race relations.

In this new decade, the league is calling for an Urban Marshall Plan, an intense national effort to educate and employ all of our people, to achieve parity, and to eliminate racism from our national life.

For its vision, leadership and exemplary work, I salute the National Urban League and ask you to join me in support for this outstanding organization.

ADDRESSING CONGRESS IS AN HONOR WHICH HAS BEEN DIMINISHED

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn that the Members of this body are diminishing the value of the honor of addressing the U.S. Congress.

Today, Mr. Nelson Mandela addressed a joint meeting of Congress. He is not a head of State nor has he been victorious in his struggle. This is unprecedented in the history of our Congress. What's more is that while all of us in Congress want to see an end to apartheid, I doubt that any of our Members would support the kind of governmentally oppressive society that Mr. Mandela would seek to impose.

Keep in mind that Mr. Mandela still actively supports Marxism. Keep in mind that Mr. Mandela still refuses to renounce violence and terrorism. Keep in mind that Mr. Mandela still publicly praises and admires tyrants and terrorists like Fidel Castro, Mu'ammarr Qadhafi, and Yasser Arafat.

In fact, Mr. Mandela recently stated that he supported the terrorists who in 1954 attempted to assassinate Members of Congress right here in the hallowed Chamber of the House of Representatives. He praised the terrorists at a rally in New York City and considered them to be comrades.

As recently as 1 month ago, Mr. Mandela declared that Cuba "stands head and shoulders above" the other nations of the world "in its love for human rights and liberty."

Fidel Castro is a tyrant and despot and Mr. Mandela's praise of him is greatly misplaced. It is precisely for this reason that five Cuban-American mayors in south Florida have de-

nounced Mr. Mandela for refusing to condemn the human rights violations in Cuba.

The United States of America and the U.S. Congress have been a beacon of leadership for the principles of liberty, democracy, and human rights for more than 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, Nelson Mandela is no friend to liberty, democracy, or human rights. He is the deputy president of the African National Congress. Their support for liberty and freedom is feigned. The ANC has announced their own constitutional guidelines which call for democracy, the freedom to form political parties, and freedoms of association, thought, worship, and the press.

However, all of these rights are subject to the direct approval of the ANC which could ban any and all state or social institutions which do not "take active steps to eradicate, speedily, the economic and social inequalities produced by racial discrimination." Further, the ANC would reserve the right to ban any or all groups which the ANC believes is ethnically or regionally exclusive.

The ANC does not respect nor defend human rights. Our own Defense Department has appropriately labeled the ANC a terrorist organization. Nelson Mandela even admitted last April that it is a practice of the ANC to torture and execute its own members when they try to exercise freedom of thought and not obey the directives of the ANC. In fact, throughout Nelson Mandela's 27 years of imprisonment, Amnesty International never recognized him as a political prisoner because he was not jailed for his political viewpoints, but for his personal involvement in violent activities.

Mr. Speaker, by allowing Nelson Mandela to address the U.S. Congress without renouncing violence, terrorism, or tyranny we have done an extreme injustice to all of those persons who have come to address Congress before him.

I deeply regret the decision to invite Nelson Mandela to speak at a joint session and cannot participate under these circumstances.

AROOSTOOK MENTAL HEALTH CENTER PREVENTION PROJECT IN TOP TEN

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Aroostook Mental Health Center prevention project on being named as an "Exemplary Prevention Program" by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention. The center's project was recently designated as one of the 10 best in the country and they will be honored this Friday here in Washington for their work.

Substance abuse is a growing problem which has not limited itself to the city streets but has infiltrated our small towns as well. Therefore, the need to educate our youth to the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse is just as important in Madawaska or Caribou as it is in New York City or Miami.

In Caribou and Madawaska the Aroostook Mental Health Center is running a community-

based program to help our children, their families, and the community win the fight against drugs. The prevention project's main goal is to develop a community-based substance abuse prevention planning and service model which can be used throughout Aroostook County.

The project provides a spectrum of services such as prevention, education, outreach, intervention, and treatment. With the involvement of parents and community organizations the project provides prevention training and consultation, peer education programs for high school students, and training for parents to help their children develop coping skills. The project also cosponsors a number of prevention activities aimed directly at young people. These programs include Just Say No Clubs, Up With Teens, Buddy System, Aroostook Teen Leadership Camp, and Phone Friends.

Substance abuse is not just an individual problem, it is a community problem because it affects all of us. The Aroostook Mental Health Center's prevention project provides an excellent model for other communities to follow, as it seeks to engage the entire community in the war on drugs.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the center and the other nine winners for their work on the front lines. They are leaders in our efforts to reach the goal of a drug free America.

JOE WRIGHT—CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we learned of the death at age 37 of Joe Wright on June 15.

I first came to know Joe Wright in the course of years-long effort among Members of Congress and other civil rights activists to overthrow the 1972 convictions of the Wilmington 10, nine black men and one white woman, unjustly convicted for allegedly setting fire to a grocery store in Wilmington, NC. Joe was one of the Wilmington 10 defendants.

Civil rights leaders nationwide charged that the arrests and trials were racially motivated, designed to punish the 10 defendants because of their civil rights activities. Joe Wright and the other nine members of the Wilmington 10 became the rallying point for other civil rights activities throughout the South.

Many Members of Congress protested what were generally considered to be political prosecutions. Amicus briefs were filed by Members of Congress demanding new trials.

In 1978, after questions were raised about the fairness of the trial, Gov. James B. Hunt, Jr., released Joe on parole. He was already on study release at North Carolina State University.

In 1980 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit reversed the convictions, ruling unanimously that the defendants had been denied a fair trial. North Carolina officials chose not to seek new trials. Joe was recently successful in obtaining an expungement of his record, representing himself before the North Carolina courts.

Upon his release, Joe came to Washington, DC and served on my staff from 1979 to 1981. He did a fine job, made many friends on the Hill, and was active in civil rights activities.

One could well understand if Joe had emerged from his imprisonment and unjust conviction an embittered man. But such was not the case. He left prison determined to work to make our legal system a better one. During his time on my staff and since, his dedication never faltered. At the time of his death, Joe was looking forward to attending law school in the fall, and to putting to work for social change the skills and knowledge he expected to master there.

All of us who knew and loved Joe Wright were saddened by news of his passing. He was a major hero of the national civil rights movement. He was also a gentle and kind man who leaves a legacy of warmth and affection.

HONORING NEW MEXICO FOREST SERVICE EMPLOYEES

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month 13 outstanding Forest Service employees in New Mexico were honored by Agriculture Secretary Clayton Yeutter. These superior public servants deserve congressional recognition as well.

The Forest Service staff of the Ghost Ranch Living Museum in Abiquiu received the Superior Service Award for Education and Information. Those honored include Group Leader Albert Martinez, and group members Frances Quintana, Higinio Romeor, Wilfred Sandoval, Benjamin Romero, Fidel Martinez, Elifido Lopez, Robert Garcia, Pacomio Salazar, and Bennie Morales.

These outstanding workers are being recognized for exceptional performance in maintaining, improving, and staffing the Ghost Ranch Living Museum to provide a superior center for environmental education and natural resource information.

The men and women of the Ghost Ranch Living Museum do not have an easy task. They educate visitors using only what mother nature has provided—native, flora, fauna, and habitat. That means putting bobcats, eagles, and lobo wolves in truly natural settings—right down to the sense of space and right down to the type of soil that a specie expects to find. Metal bars don't fool a bear; traditional cages are strictly out.

Every year 100,000 visitors navigate pot-holed two-lane highways to see the exhibit just north of the village of Abiquiu. Once there, they learn the history of a particular native animal, the habits and traits of that specie, how an enclosure answers that animal's needs. Visitors get guided tours, interpretive talks, and individual attention.

Much of what the staff teaches is not written in books. To find out, for example, why a bobcat prefers one perch to another or that a wire fence is more pleasing to a migratory elk's sense of space than a concrete wall,

employees spend long hours talking to specialists and walking through the habitat to note its most minute details. Literally and figuratively these men and women go the extra mile.

Rodney Replogle, an audio visual production specialist in New Mexico, also received a Superior Service Award for Education and Information. He is being recognized for his contribution for improving the public awareness of the natural world through his audiovisual exhibits and displays.

Tom Pettigrew, a highway engineer, received a Superior Service Award for Management Effectiveness and Improvements. Mr. Pettigrew's long-term superior service truly reflects the Forest Service mission of caring for the land and serving people.

Louis Romero, a management analysis officer, also received a Superior Service Award for Management Effectiveness and Improvements. Mr. Romero is being recognized for his work in promoting humanistic policies leading to innovation, productivity, and job satisfaction among Federal employees.

These 13 superior public servants work under the direction of Regional Forester Dave Jolly who also deserves credit for providing a positive work environment for his employees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating and honoring these outstanding men and women who have excelled in public service.

SOUTH GATE, CA—ALL-AMERICAN CITY 1990

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the community of South Gate, CA, for its recent acceptance of the 1990 All-America City Award.

This award, which is presented by the National Civil League and sponsored by the All-state Foundation, was bestowed on the city of South Gate on June 9, 1990. South Gate was chosen from among a pool of 113 applicants in recognition of civil excellence and an ability to improve civic infrastructure. An "All-America City" is described as one which has "worked together to identify and solve common problems."

It is refreshing to see communities that have overcome internal differences succeed in the implementation of programs that revitalize the economy and open opportunities to the residents. South Gate takes pride in three specific programs that have helped the city get back on track after several years of decline: The South Gate Youth Commission, the Smokestacks to Shortstacks—a program of economic recovery and development—and the program entitled Bridging the Cultures. These programs are a direct result of efforts to redevelop community prosperity following various plant closings in the 1970's and 1980's. The 1970's also brought a shift in the ethnic makeup of the area, creating various culture and social problems.

To combat this array of dilemmas, volunteers offered time and money. In 1988 South

Gate joined five surrounding cities to address unemployment and job training, using funds from the Federal Job Training Partnership Act. With the help of local government and schools, efforts were made to reach out to the new Latino population. The South Gate Youth Commission also made great inroads with programs ranging from career days to antigang and antidrug rallies.

Strong leadership and community willingness are two key factors in achieving success at revitalization. These elements made it possible for the city to be named "All-America 1990" and it is with pride that I commend the community of South Gate for a remarkable effort.

SHOULD WE FUND THE NEA?

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, Congress is engaged in an important debate over the future of Federal support for the arts.

Should we continue to fund artistic endeavors?

If we subsidize the arts, what kind of projects are worthy of Government support?

It is a serious question which deserves serious debate.

All of us are acutely aware of the controversy swirling around the National Endowment for the Arts, a controversy sparked by two exhibits—those of Robert Mapplethorpe and Andre Serrano. I am sure that each of my colleagues has received letters and phone calls from constituents who are concerned with the kind of projects paid for, in part, by their tax dollars.

Let me be clear about my position on this issue. While I have not seen the works involved in the NEA controversy, information that I have reviewed convinces me that I would find them extremely disgusting and vile.

For that reason, I voted last fall to discipline the NEA for funding activities which constituted an affront to the moral and religious sensibilities of the vast majority of the American people.

When the House of Representatives considered the 1990 appropriations bill containing funding for the NEA, I voted with the majority to cut Endowment funding. That vote sent a very clear message that the NEA violated its statutory authority in permitting the works in question to be funded.

In response to congressional concern about these exhibits, the final version of the bill prohibits the NEA from using any funds to support obscene art or art without "serious literary, artistic, political or scientific value."

I believe that these restrictions are justified, that taxpayer dollars not go to fund what most would see as pornographic. Artists would still be able to create works of their choosing, but when they depend on Government funds, they will have to abide by these regulations.

They would make the choice.

On the other hand, I disagree with some of my colleagues who have suggested that instead of addressing this controversy, we should simply cut out all funding for the NEA.

If they are successful in their efforts, it would destroy an agency which has funded many deserving activities and projects.

In my home State of Arkansas, NEA funding has supported many worthwhile projects—projects which have touched the lives of thousands of citizens.

Symphonies, traveling art exhibits, and local arts organizations have received NEA money. In my State, it would be difficult—if not impossible—to continue these programs if NEA ceased to exist.

If we permitted the destruction of this program because errors in judgment allowed the funding of two objectionable exhibits, we would be epitomizing the saying about throwing the baby out with the bath water.

I would urge that we not eradicate support for the arts simply because this is a difficult problem to resolve.

I believe that Federal support for the arts should continue—under appropriate guidelines, guidelines intended to prevent the type of problems NEA has recently encountered.

The arts are an important part of an overall education. They should not be neglected.

WALKING THAT LAST MILE WITH NELSON ROLIHLEHLA MANDELA

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to pay tribute to a man who, through his own dogged persistence, endurance, and sheer will to survive, has become not only a symbol of the struggle for social and economic justice in his own land of South Africa but—just as importantly—has also become a giant symbol upon which all of humanity can focus and gain needed inspiration in the too often lonely and difficult struggle for human rights for all men.

This man—Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela—through his own life's struggles, setbacks, and triumphs has come to embody the very essence of his own words, namely, that "To deny any person their human rights is to challenge their very humanity."

The names in the South African struggle may not be familiar to us all: Sharpeville, Soweto, Crossroads, Biko. But we find common ground and empathy when we remember our own Selma, Birmingham, Little Rock, and King.

However, lest we settle for the cheaper satisfactions of mere sentimentality, Nelson Mandela is quick to continually remind us that, amidst the cheers, handshakes, and falling tickertape that have followed in his wake—as he makes his way across the United States—"We have yet to arrive at a point that we can say South Africa is set on an irreversible course to a democratic, united, and nonracial country."

Until this happens, he reminds us, we must not lift the economic sanctions we now impose on that land. "We would be fools," he adds, "to think that the road ahead is without obstacles."

So, Mr. Speaker, to us Americans who have given him and his people such a joyous, tumultuous welcome here he says, "Together with you, we have made Government listen. We have broken the walls of South African jails."

"Victory is in sight," he tells us. "We ask you to walk this last mile with us. Nothing will stop our date with destiny."

Mr. Speaker, the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands join me in paying well-deserving tribute to this man who has given us a means of alliance with his people's struggle for freedom that is totally consistent with our national history, our national goals, and our national ideals.

COUNT MILITARY PERSONNEL STATIONED OVERSEAS AT THEIR HOME OF RECORD

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 4903 which would direct the Census Bureau to count all overseas military personnel at their home of record for purposes of reapportionment. For years I have advocated census practices which will ensure the right of all citizens to be accurately counted in the census.

Our military personnel stationed overseas were finally included in the census process last year. However, they will be counted at their last place of stateside residence, not where they call home.

It only makes sense that our overseas military should be counted in the place they call home and the place they visit on holidays. Our overseas military personnel usually do not consider the location where they were last stationed home.

For purposes of congressional representation, areas which do not have military bases should not have their one person-one vote right diluted by skewed methods of census counting.

I was very pleased to join my colleagues, and especially my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], as a cosponsor of this bill to ensure our overseas military personnel are counted where they belong, at their home of record. Service personnel declare their home of record at the time of enlistment and it follows them throughout their tour of service.

Remember, on the floor of the House 2 years ago, this body rejected the current approach of counting military personnel at their last place of stateside residence.

I would like to thank the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [BILL FORD], for bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the Subcommittee Chairmen Mr. SAWYER and Mr. RIDGE for their leadership on this very important issue.

I urge the rest of my colleagues to join in support of this legislation to count overseas

military personnel at their home of record, which is only fair and just.

MANDELA SPEAKS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the incredible achievements of Nelson Mandela. Today, in a joint session of the Congress, Nelson Mandela becomes only the third private citizen in the history of this country to address this body.

It has been said that great men are not born, but are shaped by their circumstances. To paraphrase, the great American poet, Maya Angelou, diamonds are created by pressure. Nelson Mandela is South Africa's most precious diamond.

In South Africa, the apartheid regime exerts incredible pressures on the lives of black people. However, leaders such as Stephen Biko and Nelson Mandela have emerged despite this pressure. Instead of bending to the regime or breaking under its pressure, the great leaders of South Africa have become stronger and strengthened the black community.

Thirty years ago Nelson Mandela was tried and convicted for treason. By an ironic and peculiar twist, the apartheid regime concocted the ludicrous argument that it was treason to encourage the black citizens of South Africa to band together and protest to seek redress from their Government. In South Africa, the rule of law is sometimes replaced with a rule of thumb.

The Government opened fire on the group. Scores of people were killed in the Sharpsville massacre. Nelson Mandela and over 20 other defendants stood trial and were convicted and given a life sentence. This may seem like a strange turn. However in South Africa, such twists and turns are to be expected.

Following his conviction Nelson Mandela went to prison at Robben's Island. He spent 27 years at Robben's Island. However, while he was there he did not give up the desire to be free or the belief that he be free one day. His wife, Winnie Mandela, a tireless and courageous woman, spoke on his behalf to the outside world. I salute her tireless devotion to the struggle to obtain freedom for her country and her husband. It was through her outspoken and diligent efforts that the world was not allowed to forget this noble man. Together, they fought to gain the release of all those who had been unjustly imprisoned. At 70, he was released. After 27 years, this modern Jonah came out of the belly of the whale unscarred and still able to speak eloquently and without malice about the evil that had held him there for so long.

Today, Nelson Mandela spoke to a joint session of the U.S. Congress. His words resounded with a message which was soft-spoken yet unequivocal: Apartheid must end.

LONG-TERM WATER AND POWER NEEDS OF INSULAR AREAS, H.R. 2567

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2567 legislation which will, in part, authorize funding for the Bureau of Reclamation to study the long-term water, sewer, and power needs of the insular areas of the United States. This legislation passed the House of Representatives on June 14, 1990.

Mr. Speaker, American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands comprise this country's overseas territories. None of them has water, sewer, or power systems which would be considered adequate by residents of the 50 States. The recent devastation of the Virgin Islands by Hurricane Hugo, and a similar devastation of the Manu'a group of islands in Samoa in 1987, and again in February of this year have brought to the forefront the inadequacy of the water and power systems in our insular areas. The residents of these areas frequently receive contaminated or inadequate supplies of water and power. When hurricanes come, and they come frequently, there is no drinkable water, no power, and no sewage treatment.

The results of the study this bill authorizes will assist the Federal and territorial governments in determining the magnitude of the problem and the steps that should be taken to correct it.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended that this statement be inserted in the RECORD during the debate of the bill on the floor but it was inadvertently not submitted.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the amendment to the bill would not have been possible without the support of Mr. GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the Water and Power Subcommittee and Mr. RON DE LUGO, chairman of the Territorial and International Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Congressman BOB LAGOMARSINO and BEN BLAZ also contributed significantly to the final product.

THE WAR AGAINST ENERGY WASTE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my friend and colleague, Mr. MACHTEY, in introducing legislation that will bring more effective energy conservation to the Department of Defense.

Among all Government agencies and branches, the Department of Defense has been the most successful in achieving energy savings. In fiscal year 1989, the Department accomplished a 5.4-percent reduction in total

energy costs, over halfway to the Federal Energy Management Improvement Act's goal of a 10-percent reduction by 1995. Yet there are significant savings still available, especially in light of the fact that the Defense Department's energy budget exceeds \$2.7 billion a year—representing over 80 percent of the total Federal energy budget.

At present, there is little reason for a military base commander to begin a program of investments in energy conservation or renewable energy technologies. Under current regulations, if there are savings in energy costs, they may be used only during the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. An accurate evaluation of savings, however, is not usually available until the end of the fiscal year, leaving no time for use of the savings.

In pursuing conservation, base commanders must divert the precious resources of money and staff time to new plans and strategies. These strategies will, in the end, save the Government a considerable amount of money. Yet those stationed at a base currently see no benefits from their efforts. These individuals are on the frontline of the war against waste, and they should be compensated for their role.

Our legislation rewards a base commander and his base by passing along a share of the accomplished savings during the succeeding fiscal year for morale, recreation, or minor military construction. This share would amount to one-third of the savings, with one-third going to the Treasury for deficit reduction, and the remaining one-third targeted for further energy investments at the base.

This bill enables Congress to in one stroke help the environment, reduce the deficit, and boost morale among our Nation's military forces taking the lead in energy conservation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this proposed legislation will be well received by my colleagues, and I urge them to join Mr. MACHTLEY and me in support of this legislation.

HONORING RONNIE AND MICHAEL BECHER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this past week in my home State of New York, two outstanding members of the community, Ronnie and Michael Becher, were honored as shomrim, guardians of Jewish unity. I would like to join the group that bestowed this honor, CLAL Yisrael—the National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership—in recognizing the accomplishments of the Bechers.

Michael Becher's experiences as a Holocaust survivor have driven him to dedicate his efforts to political action. He is a member of Salanter/Akiva/Riverdale Academy Board of Trustees, and he serves on the national executive committee of the American Israel Political Action Committee and on its New York board. He and his wife are both members of AIPAC's National Senate Club.

Among her many activities, Ronnie volunteers her time as executive vice president of the Hebrew Institute of Riverdale and is coordinator of the Woman's Tefilah of Riverdale.

The honor of being named shomrim reflects a devotion and commitment to Jewish causes and organizations. Through their work with Jewish groups and many other community services, Michael and Ronnie Becher have shown true leadership and civic responsibility. I congratulate the Bechers and wish them many more years of good health and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO GOLDEN AGE SENIOR CITIZENS OF LOCAL UNION 1331

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Golden Age Senior Citizens of Local Union 1331, an organization that for the past 30 years has served the interests of retirees of L.T.V. Steel, formerly Republic Steel, in my 17th Congressional District of Ohio.

Founded in 1960 by Joseph Hallas, with the assistance of Harry Prislipsky, George Yaroscak, and George Vukovich, this seniors' organization has been a focal point for communal activity among retired L.T.V. steelworkers throughout the Mahoning Valley. Currently, the union proudly boasts 5,000 retirees in its membership, the largest such organization in the State of Ohio.

The present officers of the Golden Age Senior Citizens Local Union 1331 are: Fred Fortunato, president; Joseph Hallas, vice president; Joseph Carlini, secretary; J.R. Moore, financial secretary; Joe Ryzner, treasurer; Lena Costello, trustee; Dan Walters, trustee; Steve Garasic, guide; and Mary Walters, publicity.

Again, I would like to recognize the Golden Age Senior Citizens of Local Union 1331 on their 30-year anniversary. I am proud and honored to represent such a fine organization.

HONORING THE WAHCONAH RE- GIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STATE QUIZ TEAM CHAMPIONS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Wahconah Regional High School quiz team, which recently won the High Q finals and became the Massachusetts State champions. Wahconah Regional High School is located in Dalton, a charming site in the Berkshire Hills, and a most praiseworthy educational facility.

High Q is a statewide scholastic competition involving over 100 Massachusetts public and private secondary schools. To attain a spot in

the final championship, the team reigned victorious in both the quarter- and semi-final matches. It was only through the drive and dedication of this team that such a goal was attainable. The team managed to defeat Stonham High School by a score of 480 to 440.

I am delighted when I think of the constructive way in which these students are growing and developing during these formative years. They have chosen to adopt positive leadership roles and that in itself deserves recognition. Winning the State championship in High Q is the icing on the cake.

My sincere personal praises go to the captain of the team, Michael Donahue, and the other members of the team, John Mason, Stephen Hamm, and Kara Louison. They each contributed significantly to the success of their team.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy for and proud of the quiz team. Their exemplary performance deserves the highest commendation. I extend my most heartfelt congratulations to the Wahconah Regional High School quiz team and wish them continued success in their academic careers.

TRIBUTE TO THE GENERAL FED- ERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs truly has "a past to remember, a future to mold." Since its founding, the federation has brought together local women's clubs from around the country and throughout the world. It is admirable that all of their member clubs evolve around community improvement through volunteer service.

The GFWC's programs promote conservation, education, the arts, and health care planning here in the United States. Internationally, they promote educational and cultural exchanges.

The GFWC has made substantial achievements in our communities; 75 percent of our Nation's public libraries were established by this fine organization. They helped to establish kindergartens as part of the public schools for adults as well as reforms in the juvenile court system.

My praise in the federation's achievements could go on and on. The GFWC has proven time and again how much they have contributed to our society.

It is with great pleasure that I salute the 100th anniversary of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. I wish them continued success.

THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF CHIEF RONALD NELSON

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chief Ronald Nelson of the city of Berkeley's Police Department on the occasion of his retirement, and to draw attention of my colleagues to his distinguished record.

Chief Nelson has been the chief of police for Berkeley since 1982 managing a 300-person full-service department. It is important to note that many of the citizens of the city of Berkeley have a direct, proprietary interest in the functions and services of its police department, and the Berkeley police have undoubtedly had more sensitivity training sessions on the city's multiethnic and multicultural population than any other city of its size.

Before coming to Berkeley, Chief Nelson was city manager of the city of Compton, after having served as the assistant city manager of that city. He has also served as chief of police for the China Lake Police Division of the U.S. Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, CA, and as police commander with the Compton Police Department. He received his early training and experience with the Los Angeles Police Department, which he joined in 1956 as a police officer, advancing to sergeant, lieutenant I and then lieutenant II.

Chief Ronald D. Nelson received his bachelor of arts degree from Drake University, his master of arts degree from Pepperdine, and did additional academic work in sociology and public administration at California State University at Los Angeles, Loyola Marymount, Fort McClennan, California Institute of Technology, and California Polytechnic University. He is also credentialed by the State of California to teach and has taught at Cerro Coso Community College.

It is a pleasure to join with my constituents in recognizing Chief Nelson's work over the years and to wish him every success in his future endeavors.

NELSON MANDELA'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today we marked a new era in the ongoing struggle against South Africa's apartheid government. We have been joined by a black leader of phenomenal spirit, a vocal activist in South Africa's most prominent black organizations, Nelson Mandela. Released from prison only a few short months ago, Mr. Mandela has continued his fight for the termination of South Africa's oppressive apartheid.

For 27 years, Mr. Mandela's voice was heard from behind the bars of a prison cell. Though sometimes that voice was muffled, Mr. Mandela managed to continue his campaign against the white minority government.

And in the end, his patience and determination has begun to prevail.

Mr. Mandela is making this monumental trip in the name of furthering his goal. He has come to encourage this country to continue to pursue economic sanctions against South Africa. It is those same sanctions demonstrated globally, that have kept the pressure on the Government of South Africa and brought the dynamic changes to which President F.W. de Klerk referred last month in Brussels. But those changes have not been comprehensive. The majority of the South African people have little if no political power at all. We must continue to pressure the Government in order to achieve that same goal of political freedom on which our country was founded. This year we have witnessed phenomenal changes in the political attitude of the global community. Is it not right to continue to encourage South Africa to make the same changes? To encourage the white minority government to allow the majority to have a voice in their government? I think so. Without continuing the pressure that we have maintained on South Africa's Government, the apartheid system will remain in place.

I congratulate Mr. Mandela on his persistence and his ability to lead his people to meet the challenges which will topple apartheid. I encourage him to continue his crusade through peaceful means, those same means promoted by Martin Luther King, Jr. The renunciation of a violent, armed struggle, and the persistent use of peaceful methods will ensure a continued commitment to his cause by the international community. I enthusiastically welcome him to this country and I wish him luck in his endeavors.

AN EXAMPLE OF AMERICAN GENEROSITY

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to publicly express my deepest appreciation for the assistance given to a family in my district after one member of that family was seriously injured in the recent explosion aboard the U.S.S. *Midway*.

Robert "Shane" Kilgore, a fireman aboard the *Midway*, was one of 16 crewmen injured in last Wednesday's explosion. He is now being treated at the Brooke Army Medical Center at Fort Sam Houston, TX, and is receiving the best care possible.

I would like to thank the Navy for arranging accommodations for Fireman Kilgore's parents and other family members. I would also like to thank two public-spirited companies for their generosity. Continental Airlines agreed to fly the family from Los Angeles to San Antonio at no charge, and Prime Time Shuttle, an airport transportation company, provided free transportation for the family to Los Angeles International Airport. Those companies' quick and compassionate response was greatly appreciated by Fireman Kilgore's family and by myself.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great American tradition to come to others' aid in times of crisis. I am

pleased to share with my colleagues this outstanding example of the spirit of compassion and caring that has helped make our country what it is today. I'm sure they join with me in thanking the Navy, Continental Airlines, and Prime Time Shuttle for their efforts, and in extending our prayers for Shane's recovery.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN PAUL McCLELLAN

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting Mr. John Paul McClellan, who is celebrating his 50th year as a National Association of Letter Carriers [NALC]-AFL-CIO member. He was honored on Sunday, June 24, 1990, at a dinner in my congressional district.

As a card-carrying union member nearing my 40th anniversary with the I.B.E.W., I am in a position to appreciate the commitment John Paul has shown to the cause of working men and women everywhere. John Paul has served as president of NALC branch in my congressional district from 1968 through the present date. He formerly served as a District Ten officer in the California State Association of Letter Carriers.

Please join me in recognizing John Paul McClellan, who has led the fight for justice and dignity for America's letter carriers for half a century. We look forward to many more years of his outstanding contributions.

SANTEE COOPER HELPS PRESERVE THE LOGGER

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Georgetown County in my home State of South Carolina has enacted a progressive program to protect loggerhead sea turtles. The county is the first in my State to pass an ordinance to minimize beach lighting during the turtle's nesting season. And, Mr. Speaker, I am proud that our State-owned utility, Santee Cooper, has volunteered to implement a public awareness campaign to encourage compliance with the new law.

The loggerhead turtle, which is our State reptile, is a threatened species in South Carolina. This makes the Georgetown County and Santee Cooper interest in protecting the turtles even more significant.

Georgetown County's ordinance will regulate artificial lighting along the oceanfront to safeguard female turtles and hatchlings during the nesting season, which lasts from May through October. Street lights, security lights or even house lights can disorient the turtles. They often confuse artificial light with the natural illumination of the ocean. And, rather than heading for the sea, they head farther inland

where they may be trapped in vegetation, hit by cars or eaten by predators.

Santee Cooper recognized the Georgetown County program as an important environmental effort, and I am pleased to say they did not hesitate to volunteer help. Santee Cooper organized and launched a public awareness campaign to notify the citizens and many visitors to the beaches of Georgetown County that care should be taken to protect the turtles. Santee Cooper is distributing free bumper stickers and light switch stickers to residents and visitors to encourage them to turn off beachfront lights after 10 p.m. during the nesting season. The utility is also assisting the county with shielding and screening artificial lighting along the oceanfront.

Santee Cooper's involvement in the turtle program is just the latest effort in a tradition of environmental concern. Throughout its 56-year history in our State, Santee Cooper has worked to preserve and protect the environment. Santee Cooper is known for its timber program, flood control, and protection of striped bass in its lakes. Santee Cooper has also been an innovator in areas of aquatic weed control, agricultural research, and the fight against acid rain.

It is encouraging to see the cooperation between Georgetown County and Santee Cooper on this important project. I am proud of the initiative taken to preserve this threatened species, and I commend the Georgetown County Council and the board and staff of Santee Cooper for their efforts to preserve our natural heritage.

MASS MAILINGS

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation that would call for a public accounting, on a semiannual basis, of the extent to which mass mailings are made using the franking privilege. At the present time there is no coordinated reporting system.

Although it is possible to obtain the information, it is not in a form readily accessible to the American public and taxpayers.

This legislation does not create a new limit on the number of mailings. Members of Congress may send out each year. I, like a number of Members of Congress who have sent mailings sparingly during their tenure in office, am frustrated by Members who bemoan the number and costs associated with mass mailings, while at the same time are sending mass mailings.

Although there appears to be legislation that calls for new limits on the number of mailings, there is not, to my knowledge, a straight forward bill that calls for disclosure in the form of a semiannual report that records the number of mailings and the quantity of each of those mailings. It is my belief that the public wants to know how much mass mail is being sent and this legislation will answer that question.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me and support the right of the public to know about mass mailings.

TAMPA'S DESIGNATION AS AN ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1990

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my hometown, Tampa, FL, which recently was named one of the Nation's 10 All-American cities by the National Civic League. With this award, the league recognizes cities that solve local problems through active citizen participation and cooperation.

The All-American City Award is the oldest and most respected community recognition program in the United States. Since its inception in 1949, more than 4,500 American communities have applied for the honor, but only 400 have been selected. Recipients are chosen for their success in bringing business, government, and citizens together at the local level to solve community problems such as

economic decline, hunger, natural disasters, affordable housing, health care, homelessness, drugs, and aging.

We are proud of our fair city by the bay. Tampa is touted as the "next great American city" and has been selected to host the 1991 Super Bowl for its 25th anniversary celebration. The All-American City Award recognizes the many conscientious citizens and civic leaders who work together to make Tampa a great place to live.

Tampa's award was based on three innovative projects initiated under the leadership of our dynamic mayor, Sandy Freedman. First is "Paint Your Heart Out, Tampa." Through this program, thousands of volunteers, using donated paints and brushes, paint and clean up homes of low-income and elderly residents. This year, about 3,000 people painted more than 100 homes. Next, Tampa's "Peer-to-Peer" program helps stop code violations such as junk cars, overgrown yards, and deteriorating houses. City officials encourage community groups to recognize violations and send postcards to alert the owners about problems. Last the "Quick Uniform Attack on Drugs," or the QUAD Squad, is a special police force that focuses on drug dealers in inner-city neighborhoods. Officers are assigned to specific city quadrants, and carry beepers which citizens call to report suspected drug activities. Because of this program, response time and relationships between police and citizens have improved.

Mayor Freedman and her staff, especially Bob Harrell, Roger Wehling, Joe Huskey, Nick D'Andrea, Jr., Larry Canalejo, and Bill Doherty, deserve credit for these fine accomplishments. The Tampa Police Department, Lt. John Cuesta III and Sgt. John Garcia also deserve praise. Citizen volunteers like Margaret Vizzi, Doug Lobel, Tom Willett, Linda Hope, and Alice Kelly, as well as other political, business, and civic leaders, have earned high acclaim for their creativity and commitment. Their successful campaigns greatly aided Tampa's efforts to combat those problems familiar to cities throughout America.

My sincere congratulations to Tampa, a city for the 21st century.